

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

Is there a more beautiful verse in all the Bible than the seventh verse of the first chapter of the Apocalypse? Is there a verse more beautiful in thought or in expression? 'Behold, he cometh with the clouds; and every eye shall see him, and they which pierced him; and all the tribes of the earth shall mourn over him. Even so, Amen.' And yet how few of us have heard it taken as the text of a sermon.

Let us judge by the sermons that are published. There are only seven that we know of. There is one in Spurgeon's *Sermon Notes*, one in Mr. Francis Bourdillon's *Short Sermons*, one by Archbishop Thomson in the *Contemporary Pulpit*, one in Mr. H. W. Little's *Arrows for the King's Archers*, one in the *Church Pulpit Year Book for 1908*, one by Mr. Edwin Eland in the 64th volume of the *Christian World Pulpit*, and one in Archdeacon Wilberforce's recent volume entitled *New (?) Theology*. That is to say, there are only two recent sermons on this text worth reckoning with; and even Archdeacon Wilberforce's sermon was preached on behalf of the S.P.G.—not to expound the text, but to secure a good collection.

But Archdeacon Wilberforce has the courage to take the text in its proper meaning. He is the only preacher of them all who unhesitatingly and unflinchingly does so. To the rest the text is

either a mere motto for a sermon on the Second Coming, in which the fact of the Advent is affirmed whatever the manner of it be, so that only the first and least part of the text is taken into account; or else, if the remainder of the text is made use of, it is used as if it spoke of 'a certain fearful expectation of judgment.'

This is not to be wondered at. The commentators have never been quite outspoken about the meaning of the verse. But now at last a commentary has been published which not only expounds the meaning of the Greek words in all its clauses (that was already done by Professor Swete), but which also shows its connexion with the context, and brings out without a moment's hesitation the blessedness of the gospel contained in it, and the limitless length to which that gospel goes.

It is a commentary by the late Professor Hort. Was there ever a man who published so little in his lifetime, and had so much published after his death? There is a feeling abroad, says Dr. Sanday, that injury is done to the reputation of the great men who are gone by publishing works, and still more fragments of works, which they had themselves in no sense prepared for publication. And he says it is doubtless true that there are not many scholars who would care to have such a

test applied to them; 'but Dr. Hort was just one of these few.'

It is to Dr. J. O. F. Murray we owe it that so many of Professor Hort's writings have been published. Great teacher never had more loyal pupil. It is to Dr. Murray we owe it also (although in this instance he has been assisted by Mr. P. H. L. Brereton) that there has now been published a commentary by Professor Hort on the first three chapters of *The Apocalypse of St. John* (Macmillan; 5s.).

Professor Sanday has written a preface to the book. 'I am not sure,' says Professor Sanday, 'that I know any example of Professor Hort's work that is more instructive than the fragment before us. It is no doubt scholarship in undress—utterly in undress, but perhaps on that account all the more impressive. It is all absolutely bare and severe; there is not a word of surplusage. One seems to see a living scholar actually at work; his mind moving calmly and deliberately from point to point, testing each as it comes up by the finest tests available, and recording the results by a system of measurements equally fine. To understand the patience, thoroughness, and searching quality of such judgments, is to understand what the highest scholarship really means.'

Does Dr. Sanday approve of all that has been published? Nearly all. 'With a single very small exception—the little volume *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, in which however there are a few sentences scattered through it that I value highly—I should fully endorse their decision to publish. We could not afford to lose the dry light and careful circumspect method of *Judaistic Christianity*, and *The Christian Ecclesia*. But in positive value for the student I should be inclined to place first of all the exegetical fragment on 1 St. Peter, and the present fragment very near it.'

Now when we turn to the seventh verse of the

first chapter of the Apocalypse, with Professor Hort's Commentary in our hand, the first thing we notice is that it is preceded by a verse and half of doxology. The doxology is interjected. The seventh verse continues what was begun in the first half of the fifth verse. It is the story of the King who comes to take His throne.

He comes '*with* the clouds.' It is a curious preposition. It is translated literally from Daniel (7¹³). It is translated from the Hebrew, for the Septuagint has the commoner word '*upon*.' Whether St. John himself translated directly from the Hebrew, Professor Hort does not say. Professor Swete thinks that probably he did not. For the same quotation is made in the Gospel according to St. Matthew (24³⁰), and the same preposition is used. Professor Swete thinks that there may have been a collection of prophetic testimonies in a different Greek version from that of the Septuagint, to which both St. Matthew and St. John had access. However that may be, the statement is that He comes not *upon* the clouds, but *with* the clouds, and that means, says Professor Hort, 'not simply that he has a surrounding of clouds, but that He compels all the clouds into His retinue.' The figure does not lose in sublimity with the accurate rendering of the preposition. Professor Hort adds that the later Jews called Messiah 'the Son of the Cloud.'

The remainder of the verse is a quotation from Zechariah (12^{10, 12}). 'And every eye shall see him, and they which pierced him; and all the tribes of the earth shall mourn over him.' We said that Archdeacon Wilberforce had the courage to interpret the verse accurately. The test of the interpretation is in both clauses—in the word 'every' and in the words 'all the tribes of the earth.' Archdeacon Wilberforce says it is not the lamentation of despair. For is it not said that 'every eye shall see him'? And is it not said, further, that 'only the pure in heart shall see God'? But *every* eye? Archdeacon Wilberforce is not afraid of the taunt of 'universalist'; and he

emphasizes *every* eye. He repeats the words of the last clause, 'all the tribes of the earth.' He says it will be a blessed sight even for those who pierced Him, and for all kindreds of the earth when they wail over Him—a blessed time when the fountain of repentance is opened and a baptism of tears tempers the baptism of fire.

He might have been reading Professor Hort. Professor Hort is equally comforting and equally universal. It is not a wailing, he says, because of punishment on themselves; it is the wailing of sorrowing repentance. The prophecy is not of vengeance, but of conversion. And he adds that whereas in Zechariah the reference is to the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem, here it is extended to all nations, the language commonly used of the families of the land being appropriated to the tribes of the whole earth.

The verse ends with two short separate exclamations (*ναί, ἀμήν*). One of these words, 'Amen,' has passed into every language on the face of the earth. It is said to signify 'truth.' And when it is translated it is usually translated by 'verily.' The other has so nearly the same meaning that some say they are synonymous, and that they are taken together here because the one is Greek and the other Hebrew, like 'Abba, Father' (*ἀββᾶ, ὁ πατήρ*). Dr. Hort does not believe that they are synonymous. They occur together again in Rev 22²⁰, where they clearly have a separate force, and the one is translated 'Yea' and the other 'Amen.' They occur together once more in 2 Co 1²⁰. What is their meaning? Says Professor Hort, the *Yea* (or 'even so,' as it is translated here) is the divine affirmation; the *Amen* is the human response.

One of the most accomplished scholars in Oxford, a scholar who is at the same time one of the staunchest adherents of the Higher Criticism of the Old Testament, has come to the conclusion that the Decalogue is due to the authorship of

Moses. He has published his conclusion and the reasons for it in the *Journal of Theological Studies* for April.

The article has the modest title of 'A Theory of the Development of Israelite Religion in Early Times.' But the editors have given it the first place in their journal, and more than thirty valuable pages. For they know that if the Decalogue can be shown to come from Moses, or from the age of Moses, the present critical position on the early religion of Israel will have to be abandoned. The author of the article is the Rev. Charles Fox Burney, M.A., Fellow of St. John Baptist's College.

Mr. Burney believes that he has made a discovery. But he did not make it in a day. 'It has grown up in my mind bit by bit during a long period.' He is aware that he stakes his reputation on the publication of it. But he publishes it now because recent discoveries, some of them trifling enough in themselves, have enabled him to see the bearing one upon another of the different lines of evidence which he has been pursuing, and to make the general conclusion appear irresistible.

What is that general conclusion? Mr. Burney does not attempt to overturn the 'documentary hypothesis' of the Pentateuch. Some one published a book a short while ago with the title 'What if Moses wrote the Pentateuch after all?' Mr. Burney is incapable of writing such a book or asking such a question. That the Pentateuch is made up of different documents which belong to different ages, and that in consequence the prophetic period of Old Testament History is, broadly speaking, of older date than the legal, 'may now be regarded as proved up to the hilt for any thinking and unprejudiced man who is capable of estimating the character and value of the evidence.' But all that refers to the religion of Israel *after* 750 B.C. What of the religion of Israel before the great prophets began to prophecy?

That is the period with which Mr. Burney has to do.

Mr. Burney believes that the character of the religion of Israel before the prophets began to write (that is to say, throughout all the period of Joshua, the Judges, and the early Kings) has been misunderstood. It has been supposed that the prophets were the creators of the religion of Israel. Before their day, that is before 750 B.C., the Israelites professed no religion that could properly be called ethical. Their ideas and practices scarcely differed from those of the Canaanites around them. And by the dominant school of criticism, 'animism,' 'fetishism,' and 'totemism' are expressions that are freely used to describe them. It is Mr. Burney's purpose to show that from the time of Moses the Israelites possessed a religion which is entitled to be called both ethical and spiritual; a religion which was in direct antagonism to that of the Canaanites who dwelt in the land; a religion upon which the prophets worked, not to overthrow it, but to restore it to its earlier purity and to develop it in its own direction.

He believes that this ethical religion dates from the time of the Exodus. He cannot carry it further back than that. He does not deny that the religion of Israel owes much to the religion of Babylonia. He distinctly says that we cannot study the religion of Israel rightly except in the light of a systematic comparative survey of the two religions. But he holds that the influence of Babylon upon Israel is so ancient as to be a matter for the student of archæology rather than for the student of religion. Before the days of Moses the ancestors of Israel should be spoken of, not as Israelites, but as Semites; and they should be regarded as sharing in the idolatrous unethical beliefs of the Semites, or, in Mr. Burney's graphic phrase, in 'the common Semitic savagery.'

The religion of Israel began with the Exodus.

More than that, in Mr. Burney's belief it began with Moses. For Mr. Burney has great faith in the creative power of a personality. He is not the man, however, to neglect the evidence lest it should run counter to a fascinating theory. He believes that the true ethical religion of Israel, the very religion which Amos preached and Hosea practised, began with Moses, because along several different lines of evidence it can be traced back to Moses and no further. And if you ask him to say more definitely what he means by the religion of Israel, his answer is, the religion which is embodied in the Decalogue. The very reason why he assigns the Decalogue to Moses is that it embodies the religion which was practised by the Israelites whom Moses gathered into a nation and led through that great and terrible wilderness.

He is aware that there are objections and that he must meet them. There is the objection that the Decalogue breathes the spirit of a later age than that of Moses. But he has no great regard for objections which rely upon considerations that are purely subjective. That argument requires no special refutation.

More important is the objection that the thirty-fourth chapter of Exodus appears to contain a second decalogue, a decalogue of a ceremonial character, and therefore belonging to the legalistic period of Israel's religion, which, in common with all Higher Critics now, Mr. Burney believes to have succeeded and not preceded the prophetic period. Mr. Burney's answer is that the thirty-fourth chapter of Exodus, which contains this ceremonial decalogue, has no connexion with the twentieth chapter, which contains the ethical decalogue. In short, he believes that it is not a decalogue, but a summary from the hand of J of chapters 20-23, which are from the hand of E. These chapters contain both the Decalogue and also the Book of the Covenant. And this summary, if that may be called a summary which is no doubt a fragment of a quite independent

account, is all that J gives us of these two important documents.

The only serious objection is found in the historical narratives of the Old Testament itself, in the Books of Judges, Samuel, and Kings. From these books we gather that 'there existed in Israel during the greater part of the period of the residence in Canaan a kind of Jahweh worship, which found expression in the representation of Jahweh under the form of an image, and which was bound up with the practice of rites (whether of divination or of another character) in which the use of images played a prominent part.' That objection is so formidable that Mr. Burney uses two-thirds of his space in its removal. For it is evident that those who worshipped Jahweh under the form of an image, either did not know, or else disregarded, the second commandment.

It is now that Mr. Burney becomes most original and most interesting. He uses, we have said, two-thirds of his space in removing this objection. We need not use so much. But he has several lines of argument, which he works out independently before he brings them to a common conclusion, and we shall take them up separately also.

The first line of argument is that when the Israelites entered Canaan under Joshua, certain Israelite tribes were already settled there. We know the evidence for this. There is first of all the mention of Israel on the stele of the Egyptian king Merenptah. Merenptah, or his successor, was the Pharaoh of the Exodus. Yet on this stele he mentions Israelites as raided by him *in Palestine*. Then there is the evidence of the Tell el-Amarna letters. These letters speak of a people called the Habiri, who entered Canaan about 1400 B.C., that is to say, some 150 years or more before the entry of Israel under Joshua. Mr. Burney does not assert that the Habiri were Hebrews, but he thinks that that identification is as likely as any other that has been proposed. In

any case, their mention in the Tell el-Amarna letters is evidence that there was a wave of immigration into Canaan from the East a century and a half before the Conquest, an immigration, moreover, of tribes who were in all probability closely allied to Israel.

Then *Sety I., whose reign appears to fall towards the end of the fourteenth century B.C. mentions a State in Western Galilee, which he calls Asaru or Aseru. This name corresponds with the name of the Israelite tribe of Asher. Again, the word Gad, which is the name of another tribe, means 'fortune,' and is probably connected with the name of the deity Gad, the patron of fortune, who is mentioned in Is 65¹¹, and whose name frequently occurs in Phœnician and Aramaic inscriptions. It is found also as the name of a place, Baal-Gad, in the far north of Palestine, and of Migdal-Gad, a stronghold of Judah.

Now, Asher and Gad are the two tribes whose descent is traced, not from a wife of Jacob, but from a concubine, Leah's handmaid Zilpah. 'May we therefore infer,' says Mr. Burney, 'that the meaning of this tradition is that these two tribes were regarded as occupying in some way an inferior position among the tribes?' If so, then Dan and Naphtali, sons by another concubine, will occupy the same inferior position. Mr. Burney's conclusion regarding these four tribes is, not that they were Canaanites, as others (like Paton and Hogg) have said, but that they were members of the great Aramæan migration, possibly Habiri, who pressed into Canaan and settled there, perhaps some centuries before the Israelitish invasion under Joshua.

In any case, whatever their names were, Mr. Burney believes that there were tribes of Israelites in Canaan before Joshua. These tribes took no part in the Exodus, and they knew not Moses. If they worshipped Jahweh (and Mr. Burney believes that they did), they might worship Him

under the form of an image without being troubled by the second commandment.

Let us pass to another line of evidence. Let us consider the origin and antiquity of the Divine name Jahweh. The Divine *title*, Mr. Burney prefers to say. For he holds it conclusively proved that the title Jahweh or Jahu, so far from being peculiar to Israel, was well known to the Babylonians, and that with them it was not the name of any particular god, but a generic name for Deity, like El. The evidence is found in certain proper names which have been discovered on the monuments. There *Ilu-bi'di* and *Iau-bi'di* are interchangeable, just as in Hebrew the name *El-nathan* might interchange with *Jeho-nathan*.

That Jahweh was not originally a proper name is perhaps Mr. Burney's greatest discovery, and he takes some time to prove it. His best argument he owes to Mr. C. J. Ball, who is at present lecturing on Assyriology in Oxford. In the Epic of Gilgameš there is a passage in which the word *ja-u* occurs. The passage, because of the occurrence of that word, has hitherto baffled the interpreter. Gilgameš, smitten with grief at the death of his friend Eabani, and anxious to discover whether the common lot of humanity can be avoided, hears of a man, *Nuah-napištim* by name, who dwells in the island of the blest. He reaches the land where *Nuah-napištim* dwells 'afar off at the confluence of the streams.' As Gilgameš is making stupendous efforts to bring his ship to land, *Nuah-napištim* views him in the distance, and says to himself—'He who comes (yonder) is he not a *ja-u* man, and has he not the right hand of a hero?' The expression, we say, has hitherto defied the expositor. Mr. Ball believes that a '*ja-u*' man is a 'god'-man. In an earlier part of the Epic, Gilgameš is described in the words—'Two-thirds of him are god, and his third part is human.' So now in speaking of him as a *ja-u*-man, *Nuah-napištim* is simply laying emphasis upon his nature as partly human and partly divine.

Well, if Jahweh was at first only the title of deity, when did it reach the position of a proper name? Not in the days of Abraham. Abraham dwelt in Ur of the Chaldees, the southern seat of the worship of the moon-god Sin. He removed to Haran, the northern seat of the worship of the same deity. To Abraham Jahweh would still be merely a title of divinity. Jahweh as a proper name, and as the name of their own proper God, was revealed to Israel in one day. This, Mr. Burney believes, is the revelation that is recorded in the third chapter of Exodus. This is the meaning of the words in Ex 6³—'I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob as God Almighty, but by my name Jahweh I was not known to them.'

We are now ready to gather the lines of evidence together. When the Israelites who came out of Egypt with Moses entered Canaan, they found that the land was already partly taken possession of by kinsmen of their own. These kinsmen may have been those who were afterwards known as the tribes of Dan and Naphtali, Gad and Asher. They knew the name of Jahweh, the God of Israel, though Jahweh may yet have been little more than a title of deity to them, as it had been to other Semites, like the Babylonians. But to the Israelites who entered Canaan under Joshua, Jahweh was more than a title for God. He was more than a common possession of the Semitic race. He had become the God of Israel. When Moses had gone down into Egypt to deliver them, he had gone down with the great name *I AM*, and *I AM* had become their deliverer. To their minds He stood distinct, not only from the gods of Egypt, but even from the great Semitic moon-god Sin. Through the wilderness of Sin He had guided them, and at Sinai, the very seat of the moon-god, He had proved Himself superior; so superior that Mt. Sinai in Arabia is now associated, and will be for ever associated, not with the Semitic moon-god Sin, but with the mighty power of Jahweh, the God of Israel.

And more than that, and very much more, the God who led the Israelites through the wilderness was a God of righteousness. Mr. Burney seems to think that a distinctly ethical quality attached to the name of Jahweh even before the days of Moses. But however that may be, it was the experience of the wilderness that made His righteousness unmistakable. The march through that great and terrible wilderness could never be other than a trying one. Without the sense of Jahweh's leadership it could not have been accomplished. But the one thing that above all other things was impressed upon the Israelites was the fact that when they were obedient they prospered, when they were disobedient disaster overtook them. And obedience did not mean the offering of bulls and of goats to appease a capricious deity. It was the obedience of the heart. It was the surrender of the will. It was perseverance in right doing between man and man.

With this conception of Jahweh as a God of righteousness, we say, the Israelites entered Canaan. Mr. Burney believes that the conception had already become embodied in the Decalogue. He believes that the hand which accomplished that master-stroke of national policy was the hand of a leader of men, the hand of a religious genius, such as appears only occasionally in the whole history of the world. He believes that the Decalogue came from the hand of Moses. But when the Israelites entered Canaan and settled down in the land there were two strong forces with which the ethical religion of Jahweh came into contact.

One of these was the religion of the Canaanites. The Canaanites still dwelt in the land, and although the whole evidence of the historical books seems to Mr. Burney to show that the Israelites never ceased to recognize the essential antagonism that lay between their own religion and the religion of the Canaanites, it is not to be wondered at if there were occasional lapses into idolatry.

The other force was the religion of the tribes of Israel who were already settled in the land. Being their kinsmen, the Israelites who had come out of Egypt at once associated with these tribes. And although we see, in the Book of Judges especially, that in the great national movement under Deborah three of them held aloof, showing that the amalgamation was yet far from complete, nevertheless they could not forget that they belonged to the same stock, that they worshipped the same God and had ultimately the same religious and ethical interests. But the Jahweh whom these tribes worshipped was not the great I AM who had been made known to Moses, nor had He led them through the wilderness. Is it to be wondered at that throughout the historical books there are not only occasional lapses into idolatry (which are admitted to be lapses and repented of), but that there is also a worship of Jahweh under the form of an image, like Jeroboam's bulls at Dan and Bethel, and that the high places, as long as they lasted, were a perpetual menace to the pure worship of Jahweh?

Mr. Burney has no desire to take away from the glory of the prophets of Israel of the eighth century B.C. It is a glory that cannot be matched throughout all the history of religion and of ethics. But the prophets of the eighth century B.C. never claim that they are making a new departure. Amos and Hosea, Isaiah and Micah, attack the social and religious abuses of their time, but they attack them *as abuses*. They regard themselves not as the founders of a new type of Jahweh religion, but as carrying a burden of reformation. They are sent to insist upon religious essentials which the people once knew and ought never to have forsaken.

In his *Commentary on the Book of Exodus*, noticed on another page, Mr. A. H. McNeile has an 'Additional Note' on the name 'Jahweh.' Mr. McNeile has no new theory to offer. But in his Additional Note he gives a competent

summary of all that is known at present about the name 'Jahweh.' And best of all, he exercises his judgment in accepting the best translation of the Name that has yet been offered.

Before looking at the meaning of the Name, however, let us look at the Name itself. Where did it come from? Mr. McNeile's Additional Note occurs at Ex 3¹⁴. That is the place at which Moses says to God, 'Behold, when I come unto the children of Israel, and shall say unto them, The God of your fathers hath sent me unto you; and they shall say to me, What is his name? what shall I say unto them?' And God answers, 'I AM THAT I AM'; and adds, 'Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you.'

Now when Moses went down into Egypt, and told the children of Israel that I AM had sent him unto them, it is improbable that that was the first time they had heard the Name. An entirely new name, says Mr. McNeile, would have meant to them an entirely new God. But if the name was in existence already, how long had it been in existence, and where had it come from? Mr. Burney thinks that it came from Babylon. Mr. McNeile does not believe that. He is not sure that the supposed traces of it in Babylonian literature are genuine. But even if they are, they only point to the introduction of foreign (that is, Western Semitic) cults.

Nor does Mr. McNeile believe that the Name is North Syrian. If the North Syrian name Iau-bi'di really contains the name of Jahweh, as Ilu-bi'di contains the name of El, and if these two names can be compared with Jeho-iakim and Eliakim, that only implies after all that the name of Jahweh came to be known to other Semitic tribes besides the Israelites. But Mr. McNeile thinks it probable that Jahweh was the name of the God worshipped by a small number of tribes or clans in the region of Sinai, and that the Israelites already knew something of Him, so that Moses

was able to bind them together by a common worship when he went down into Egypt with the name I AM.

The worth of Mr. McNeile's 'Additional Note' lies, however, in what it says about the meaning of the Name. The name Jahweh, whenever it occurs, is simply the third person singular of the imperfect tense of the verb *to be*. If we could translate the imperfect tense by the present, then we could translate the Name *He is*. When Jahweh is speaking of Himself, however, He of course uses the first person, which may therefore be translated I AM, as it is translated in Ex 3¹⁴.

But it is not quite satisfactory to translate the imperfect tense as if it were a present. As Driver states in his *Hebrew Tenses*, and as Mr. McNeile quotes the statement from him, 'the Hebrew imperfect denotes either *habitual* action or *future* action.' Now, in his article on God in the *Dictionary of the Bible*, Professor A. B. Davidson argues that the form Jahweh is intended to represent *future* action. Mr. McNeile accepts the argument. He believes that when we speak of Jahweh we are using a word which means 'He will be,' and when Jahweh spoke of Himself, He said not I AM, but I WILL BE. And when He repeated His name He said, I WILL BE THAT I WILL BE.

There is one thing more. The verb *to be* is not the verb of simple existence. As Davidson puts it, it does not mean *to be essentially* or ontologically, but *phenomenally*. In other words, it means not simply *to be*, but *to be something*. God says, 'I will be that I will be'—what He will be He does not say. He deliberately leaves that unexpressed. He leaves it to the future to discover that. He sends Moses down into Egypt with the message, 'Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I WILL BE hath sent me unto you.' It was a challenge to faith. If they knew Him in the past, they would know Him better in the future. But what He will be to them He does

not say. That will depend upon their faith in Him and their obedience.

What will He be to them? We have an advantage over the Israelites here. They could only look forward; we can look back. They could only walk by faith; we can walk by sight. What has He been to them?

He has been Creator and Preserver. But they knew that already, we may suppose. At least they knew that He was their Preserver. The suggestion has been made, and Mr. McNeile does not altogether reject it, that the verb which forms the name 'Jahweh,' and which we translate to *be*, originally meant to *fall*. And so Jahweh was He who causes rain or lightning to fall. But whether He was originally a so-called Nature-God or not, we may safely assume that, if the Israelites knew anything about Him at all, they knew that He was a God who made His sun to rise upon the evil as well as upon the good, and sent His rain upon the just and also upon the unjust.

What will their first discovery of Him now be? It will be that He is a Deliverer. It will be that He is a God who has pity. And that when He has pity He sends deliverance. We must not anticipate. But is it not said that He who came as the express image of God's person had compassion upon the multitude, and that His compassion at once translated itself into action—that He healed them and fed them, and delivered them out of their prison-house? The Israelites will discover immediately that God is a Deliverer. For Jahweh said, 'I have surely seen the affliction of my people which are in Egypt, and have heard their cry by reason of their taskmasters; for I know their sorrows; and I am come down to deliver them.'

They never forgot their deliverance. We speak of the Exodus from Egypt as the moment of their birth as a nation. They spoke of it as their Deliverance. And the two things which impressed them about it were the 'high hand'

with which Jahweh delivered them, and the 'provocation' with which, after their deliverance, the people provoked Him. All through their history they remembered the mighty works. All through their history they were amazed at the ingratitude of those in whose sight the mighty works had been wrought. When they told their children the story, they always ended with the words, 'And their carcases fell in the wilderness.' It was an awful fate for those to whom the land of the Amorites had been promised. It was a warning for the disobedient in all their generations. And yet, when Jahweh was ready to make His next great revelation to them, they missed it. They almost all missed it, through disobedience. For the next great discovery was Salvation.

Salvation is greater than deliverance. For sin is greater than sorrow. It is a great thing certainly to be delivered out of some deep distress. It is a great thing to realize that we are delivered by Jahweh. But the greatest of all things is the deliverance from sin, the deliverance which we call Salvation.

The Israelites did not know that Jahweh had come as a Saviour. They did not recognize Him. One of the reasons why they did not recognize Him was that they were thinking of their fathers' provocation, and not of their own sin. Another reason was that He did not come under the name of Jahweh. He came under the name of Jesus. It is true that Jesus means Saviour. It is true that when He came it was announced that He would save His people from their sins. But Jesus was supposed to be the son of Joseph. And just as their fathers said, 'As for this Moses we wot not what is become of him,' so they said, 'Is not this the carpenter, and are not his sisters here with us?' 'They were offended in Him. And when Jahweh was making His new revelation to them, they were crying out, 'Away with him! Crucify him!'

I WILL BE THAT I WILL BE. What will He be?

Already He has been Creator and Preserver, Deliverer and Saviour. We have made these discoveries. For the deliverance from the bondage of Egypt and the salvation from the bondage of sin are acts of history. They both belong to our past. In relation to them both we walk by sight. And how great is our astonishment, first at the provocation in the Wilderness, and next at the crucifixion on Calvary. Is it possible that, in our astonishment at the blindness of the Israelites, we are in the same condemnation through disobedience?

It is possible. For Jahweh has not yet made

the last revelation of Himself. To us still He says, I WILL BE. It is not given to any generation of men to walk entirely by sight. In the last book of the Bible there is a hint that when the new revelation comes it will come with a new name. But to whom will it come? It will come to him that overcometh. 'He that overcometh, I will make him a pillar in the temple of my God, and he shall go out thence no more: and I will write upon him the name of my God, and the name of the city of my God, the new Jerusalem, which cometh down out of heaven from my God, and mine own new name' (Rev 3¹²).

The Self-Consciousness of Jesus and the Servant of the Lord.

BY PROFESSOR THE REV. H. A. A. KENNEDY, M.A., D.Sc., TORONTO.

III.

The Influence of Isaiah.

WHEN did Jesus become conscious that His Messianic career must issue in death? Is any light attainable on the problem? How is this conviction related to His Messianic consciousness as a whole? How is it related to His consciousness of Sonship? We will attempt to discuss these far-reaching questions, not with the view of reaching definite, far less, final answers, for that is impossible, but in order, at least, to indicate that much remains to be done in this direction; that hints may be collected from the Gospels which, in any case, suggest possible solutions; that many scholars have made rash assertions because they have not clearly realized the situation. Take, for example, such a statement as that of Schwartzkopff, by no means a hasty investigator (*Prophecies of Jesus Christ concerning His death*, etc., Eng. tr. p. 26): 'No doubt he must have clearly seen from the beginning that suffering awaited him in his Messianic mission. . . . But that did not necessarily mean that the struggle would end in death. . . . [Old Testament] predictions made no

reference to a death of the Messiah. No doubt Is 53 foreshadowed the death of the Servant of the Lord, but this was explained away by the exposition of the Rabbis.' This paragraph implies that Is 53 had no special importance for the consciousness of Jesus, who would, Schwartzkopff supposes, be guided by the interpretations current in His time. We may narrow down our inquiry, then, to this: Did Jesus identify Himself with the O.T. figure of the Servant of Jehovah, and at what stage in His consciousness of Messiahship did this identification take place?

Even a cursory study of the Gospels reveals most clearly the extraordinary influence of O.T. Scripture on the mind of Jesus. It is not too much to say that His thought is steeped in O.T. religious conceptions. This can be in no sense surprising. The converse would have been quite inexplicable. If His human nature were to undergo any development at all (and, of course, a real humanity presupposes this, as the N.T. explicitly recognizes), a supremely powerful influence

must have been that of the piety which He found existing, and the sources from which that piety received its nurture. The purer the piety, the more ardently must it have turned to the prophets and psalmists, who had surpassed the other O.T. writers in loftiness of spiritual vision. Obviously the circle in which Jesus was brought up belonged to the most devout in the land. They 'waited for the consolation of Israel,' and this expectancy was mainly based on the wonderful prophetic pictures of the future. No doubt, as we discover from the mental history of the Twelve, the national idea must still have been very prominent in their Messianic hopes. Probably for that reason, the mysterious figure of the Servant of Jehovah would scarcely appeal to them. We have already seen how small a place it took in Jewish theology. It is of interest to note in passing that the translators of the O.T. into Greek, to a large extent failed to understand the conception, a fact which can be discovered from various portions of their translation of Is 53.

From His earliest years, the O.T. must have been peculiarly prized by Jesus. His soul would respond to the revelation of God which had come to illumine the world, even before He had reached that stage of intellectual growth and experience of life at which the Divine purpose, in all its grandeur, took ever more definite shape for His consciousness, and at which He felt, with deepening insight, the central meaning of His own place in the history of redemption.

Many interpreters of the Gospels have attempted to discuss the beginnings, in the spiritual experience of Jesus, of that wonderful process whose issue is disclosed in the narratives of His Baptism and Temptation. At best, this must be a precarious endeavour. For we dare not estimate the potentialities of the religious consciousness of Jesus by the standards of our own spiritual development. Thus, to say, with Holtzmann (*N.T. Theologie*, i. p. 270): 'The consciousness of being Son of God is the simplest and purest expression of attained religious perfection,' is to leave the matter precisely where it was. For it is just this 'attained religious perfection' which constitutes the problem. How did this 'attaining' relate itself to His mental and spiritual growth? How did His consciousness of Sonship emerge into the full light of mental recognition? Was there possible, in His case, any spiritual attitude towards God, without this filial

consciousness? It seems to us that only a preconceived view of history can doubt the authenticity of the beautiful incident recorded in Lk 2⁴¹⁻⁵⁰. There is not a trace of the legendary apparent in it. It is one of these recollections, traceable to Mary herself, which give their special character and colour to the earlier narratives of Luke. The interest of the scene culminates in the words of the boy Jesus: 'Knew ye not that I must be about my Father's business (or, in my Father's house)?' Here already is the consciousness of a special relationship to God.

It is plainly beyond the range of our conception to attempt to formulate the form of thought or feeling in which this consciousness emerged on the mental horizon of Jesus. Some scholars, *e.g.* H. J. Holtzmann, believe that Jesus 'referred the name "Son of God" to Himself as the Chosen of the Divine love, so that God as Father formed the correlative conception thereto' (*op. cit.* i. p. 267). Here, again, the problem really still remains. By means of what kind of experience did Jesus realize this Divine 'choice' of Himself? Others, *e.g.* Baldensperger (*op. cit.* p. 221), hold that this feeling of Sonship was 'no earlier and no later than his consciousness of Messiahship.' Such an hypothesis can be nothing else than arbitrary. The only approach towards any apprehension of the situation is from the known facts of Jesus' experience. These are only recorded fragmentarily, but the nature of them is sufficiently clear from such passages as Mt 11²⁷, 'All things were delivered to me by my Father: and no one fully knoweth (ἐπιγινώσκει) the Son, except the Father; nor doth any one fully know the Father, but the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son is willing to reveal him.' Complete mutual knowledge is the foundation of the relationship between the Father and the Son. The very use of the names Father and Son implies that that knowledge is *love*. Pure and unalloyed love toward God—that is the basis of the filial consciousness of Jesus. This love, which is the fundamental element in His personality, instinctively craves for fellowship and finds it. The love of God in unstinted measure meets His love. In that wonderful relationship He finds Himself. At what point in His developing consciousness that became clearly manifest is, after all, of secondary importance. We believe it is presupposed by the incident quoted above.

The momentous question is: How will this all-

absorbing fellowship, which is the heart and centre of His life, affect His outlook on the world? Necessarily as boundless love for men, taking the highest form which the highest love can take, the desire that they should attain to the likeness of God. This attitude was no doubt fully developed by the time of which it could be said: 'Jesus progressed in wisdom and age, and in favour with God and men' (Lk 2⁵²). But a love like this, which was the core of Jesus' self-consciousness, must, from the outset, work in His nature with tremendous motive power. It is impossible to conceive of it as a mere satisfying emotion. It must, of necessity, prompt to activity. And only one kind of activity can be associated with it as effect: that of definitely bringing men under the sway of God.

Now, as an integral part of the whole Divine saving purpose, as the next step in the self-revelation of God, one particular order of functions connected itself by a fundamental fitness with the whole bent of Jesus' thought and feeling. It was the Messiahship. The most vital element in the piety of the godliest people He knew was involved in their Messianic hopes. The authoritative ground for these hopes lay in the great forecasts of the prophets and psalmists. Jesus went to the sources. His delight in the earlier revelation was unalloyed. He searched the Scriptures for Himself. And for Him their meaning shone forth with a brightness which no other had discovered. The Divine intention took shape before the gaze of His soul. He saw the wisdom of God preparing the way for a final issue of salvation. And these ultimate operations, which were to usher in a splendid new order, were found constantly to attach themselves to an ideal person, the anointed King, who should be God's vicegerent upon earth. This was the expectation which stirred in the hearts of His devoutest friends. The picture was a glorious one: God triumphing over the oppressors of His people; God vindicating the chosen race through His kingly representative. In the Book of Daniel, which He knew, a book of extraordinary influence in that period, there was a remarkable picture of a Kingdom of the Saints which should overpower the brutal world-kingsdoms, symbolized by the four beasts (Dn 7²⁻²⁷). In this kingdom dominion was given to 'one like unto a Son of man' (v.¹³). In one important apocalyptic writing (En 37-71) this mysterious Figure was identified with

Messiah.¹ We know what significant use Jesus made of these conceptions.

But the most wonderful picture of all lay aside from the beaten track of expectation. It was the picture in the second part of Isaiah of the *Servant of Jehovah*. As we have seen, it was scarcely, by any Jewish scholars, associated with the person of Messiah. For it seemed to lack the characteristically Messianic features. And yet it must have arrested the attention of Jesus, as soon as He began to read and study the prophets. We cannot tell, of course, whether our Lord interpreted the description as belonging to a personification or to a person. The question is not of importance. The crucial matter consists in the qualities here portrayed. He is the chosen of God, in whom the heart of God delights (42¹). Yet there is nothing of pomp or fame in his aspect. He is gentle, self-restrained, quiet (42²). He deals tenderly with the weak and wavering (42³). He grows up without any ostentation (53²). There is nothing at the outset to attract men's attention (*ibid.*). As his career progresses, there is a strange blending of loftiness and lowliness. He is 'called in righteousness' to 'open the blind eyes.' He is to bring forth judgment (*i.e.* the true religion) to the nations. And yet his course is one of trial and suffering. He gives his back to the smiters: he hides not his face from shame and spitting (50⁶). He is despised and rejected of men (53³). It pleases the Lord to bruise him (53¹⁰). He is wounded for the transgressions of his brethren, bruised for their iniquities: by his stripes they are healed (53⁵). His soul is made a guilt-offering. But as the issue, he shall see a seed, he shall lengthen his days, as God's righteous Servant he shall win righteousness for many (53^{10,11}). It is not surprising that this conception seemed to the scribes to contradict the traditional Messianic pictures. Here was a figure wholly different from the powerful King who should maintain the traditions of David's victorious throne. Yet nowhere else in the O.T. is the idea of a Saviour so expressly delineated. The two pictures stand before the mind of Jesus: the Anointed King; the Suffering Servant. Must He not have reflected upon them long and earnestly? Must He not have weighed and estimated their meaning and value in the light of His own consciousness of an unsullied vision of the heart of God? Need there be a contradiction between their functions? Might

¹ Compare the Psalms of Solomon.

not the kingliest vocation of God's Anointed be that of gracious and tender service? Nay, must not self-forgetting service be the most perfect outcome of the heart of God, which He had discovered in His own experience to be pure and unmixed love? But this is *His* discovery. His most pious friends are barely able to understand Him; indeed, many are utterly bewildered. Even in the Scriptures of the O.T. there are only dim foreshadowings of this profoundest of all spiritual truths. For His soul alone it is clear as noon-day. Is not this discovery a signal mark of the Divine purpose? Is not this saving purpose interwoven with His experience? Is not He the chosen of the most High? Are these features of the Servant the lineaments of His life as consecrated to this supreme vocation? Is He to be 'despised and rejected of men': to 'bear the sins of many and make intercession for the transgressors': to 'make his soul a guilt-offering': as God's righteous Servant 'to win righteousness for many'?

The high probability that in the silent years at Nazareth He should arrive at this identification is surely by this time apparent. We believe that it almost passes into a certainty in the light of His baptism-experience. This crisis in His career is the first opportunity which the Gospels afford us of estimating the actual situation as it existed for the self-consciousness of Jesus. Numerous interpretations have been given of Jesus' resolution to be baptized by John in Jordan. We do not propose to discuss these. But let us assume, for the moment, that He had begun to associate His own vocation with the mysterious and yet so appealing Figure of the Servant, an assumption which we have already shown to be thoroughly reasonable. An epoch has arisen in the popular religion. The Baptist has sounded the note of repentance. Crowds are flocking to the Jordan, confessing their sins, and through the synbolic act of baptism indicating their desire to enter upon a new life. This new life is to be a preparation for, if not an entrance into, the approaching kingdom of God. The movement must appeal with peculiar solemnity to Jesus. It is the kind of spiritual crisis, no doubt, for which He has been waiting. If the news reaches Him, as doubtless it must, of the actual terms in which John proclaims his message, telling of One mightier than he, who is to come, the burden of men's need which lies upon His heart, the yearning love which constrains Him to devote

Himself to the service of His fellows—these influences will bring Him forth to associate Himself with the crucial opportunity which has arisen. What shall be His attitude towards this religious upheaval, this extraordinary demonstration of penitence?

If Jesus, by this time, had begun to interpret His own divinely appointed vocation in the light of the experiences of the Servant, one conviction must have taken a central place in His consciousness: the conviction that His career was to be *vicarious*. For no element was so unique, so impressive in the prophet's delineation as this. Yet what element would so directly appeal to Him? The controlling power in His being was the compassion of His boundless love seeking an outlet for its expression in self-forgetting service. To make Himself one with that erring humanity which He had learned to know, in its burdens, its sorrows, and its sins, was an aim truly befitting Him who felt that through His experience the living God was drawing near to man. Surely it was this vicarious impulse which urged Him to the banks of the Jordan. He had no personal sin to confess: in His consciousness there was no place for personal penitence. But how could He more effectively dedicate Himself to that vocation, whose vicarious character was shaping itself, or had already shaped itself for thought and feeling, than by taking His place beside the penitents and identifying His pure will with their confessions? 'Suffer it to be so now,' He urged, when John hesitated, 'for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness' (πληρῶσαι πᾶσαν δικαιοσύνην).

We wish to guard against exaggeration of evidence, but this remarkable saying seems full of illumination.¹ Various colourless explanations of the arresting word *δικαιοσύνην* have been given by commentators. When it is viewed in its intimate connexion with the step which Jesus was about to take, the step of consecration to what He knew was His Divine calling, by an act of self-identification with sinners, it is at least natural to look for light upon the word in that context in which Jesus must have felt Himself so

¹ Since these articles were written, Principal Garvie's most suggestive *Studies in the Inner Life of Jesus* has come into my hands. I find that he has interpreted this saying on precisely the same lines as I have followed. More than once he has strongly emphasized, from the same standpoint, the high importance of the Servant conception for the consciousness of Jesus.

completely at home. Now the idea of *dikaos* is prominent throughout the Songs of the Servant. That is one of his most characteristic epithets. And its intimate bearing on the passage before us is discernible in Is 53, 'My Servant the righteous, righteousness wins He for many, and their guilt He takes for his load' (so G. A. Smith, *Isaiah*, vol. ii. p. 345).

The outcome of this act of self-dedication for Jesus was of incomparable significance. It embraced a clear assurance of His Sonship and a fresh equipment with the Spirit. Let us attempt to realize what that implied. While these experiences, from the psychological standpoint, might be regarded as two aspects of the one spiritual fact, and while, in any case, they were necessarily inseparable from each other, it is legitimate to isolate them, in seeking to analyse their meaning. The assurance of the Sonship is the seal of God set upon that maturing experience of Jesus which culminated in His step of self-consecration to His mission. Here He reaches certainty as to the infallibility of His discernment in finding Himself in the crowning personification of the earlier revelation. He *is* the righteous Servant: He is God's chosen in whom He delights. Jehovah has called Him, and will hold His hand (Is 42⁶). But in union with this marvellous consciousness, which, in its ripest form, is the climax of His spiritual growth, comes the sense of a new and unparalleled endowment with the Divine Spirit. From the result of this endowment, as recorded in the Gospels, which describe Jesus as being led or driven into the wilderness by the Spirit, we may gather that its main effect was to urge Him forward to His vocation, strong in the might of God. Here, too, He would find a corroboration of His earlier discovery. For one of the most typical features

of the Servant is that God has put His Spirit upon Him (42²; cf. 61¹).

The renewed consciousness of His equipment is the signal for decisive activity. And immediately the reaction supervenes. The intensity of His eagerness to be up and doing creates a crisis in His inner life. As He confronts the stupendous task of establishing the kingdom of God, doubts press in upon His soul. 'If thou be the Son of God'—the point of gravity lies there. How shall He assure Himself that His conviction is true? Is it safe to set out on this enterprise with no further guarantee? His temptation is to test the situation by employing the superhuman powers, of which He is conscious, for material ends which, at the same time, will procure His acknowledgment as Messiah. But the *nature* of His Messiahship is itself involved in such tests. If He yields, He is committing Himself to earthly and political ideals. To be greeted as Messiah on these conditions has nothing spiritual about it. It is simply to adopt the rôle expected by the national party. Jesus thrusts the suggestion away from Him in horror. In each instance He repels the temptation by casting Himself directly upon God. Of remarkable significance is Mt 4⁴, 'Not by bread only shall man live, but by every word proceeding through the mouth of God.' This reminds us of His dependence on the earlier revelation. And there can be little doubt that when He had to choose between competing Messianic ideals, there stood clearly before His mind the figure of the Suffering Servant with which He had already identified Himself. For that was what His decision in the wilderness meant: the casting aside of the attractions of political authority and exaltation, and the deliberate choice of attainment through service, a service which essentially involved suffering.

Modern Positive Theology.

BY THE REV. JOHN DICKIE, M.A., MINISTER OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND,
TARLAND, ABERDEENSHIRE.

GERMAN theologians are at present much interested in the rise of a new Theological School, which claims to be at once modern and positive—the legitimate heir of the orthodox dogmatic tradition. The leaders of this movement are Superintendent

Theodor Kaftan, of Kiel, and Professor Reinhold Seeberg, of Berlin. They are agreed, however, not so much in matters of detail as in principle and intention, and neither can be regarded as in any way responsible for the other. The younger men,

on the other hand, seem to be for the most part pupils of Seeberg, and stand to him in a relation of conscious and acknowledged discipleship, with more or less independence according to their individuality. Of these may be mentioned Karl Girgensohn, of Dorpat; R. H. Grützmacher, of Rostock; and Karl Beth, of the Protestant Faculty at Vienna, whose book, *The Moderns and the Principles of Theology*, published a little over a year ago, is admirable both as an historical account of the movement and as an exposition of its aims, and is, perhaps, the most distinctive contribution which it has yet made to theology.

So far, Modern Positive Theology is an aspiration rather than a system. We have programmes and statements of needs and principles, but no detailed application to the whole circle of Christian truth, like Julius Kaftan's, Haering's, and Wendt's, from the Ritschlian standpoint. But, of course, the earliest of the Ritschlian dogmatic systems belongs to a much later stage in the history of the school than the Modern Positive Theology has yet reached. The fullest exhibition of the Modern Positive doctrinal standpoint is Professor Seeberg's *Fundamental Truths of the Christian Religion*, a course of sixteen lectures delivered before students of all faculties in the University of Berlin during the winter session, 1901-1902 (4th edition, 1906). Of this, Messrs. Williams & Norgate announce an English translation. These lectures are fresh, vigorous, clear, and earnest. They are interesting and stimulating where they are least convincing. In my opinion there are few more admirable statements of what the Church is than we find in the fourteenth lecture. Of a like origin and somewhat similar character is Girgensohn's 'Attempt to proclaim the Old Truth to Modern Men'—*Twelve Addresses on the Christian Religion* (Munich, 1906). Work of this nature is perhaps more required in our day than treatises addressed to the professional theologian, and all the German schools in one way or another are endeavouring to meet the need. I think we ought to give them all credit for being actuated not by mere party motives, but by a real interest in religious truth as they understand it. As the interpreter of the 'Old Truth' to 'the modern man,' Modern Positive Theology naturally takes this part of its mission with special seriousness. But important as the work of popular statement is, such a treatment of the great problems of theology inevitably glosses over many

leading questions, and leaves others altogether unanswered.

A 'Modern Positive Theology' is exposed to attack from two opposite directions. Many 'Moderns' will find it not sufficiently 'Modern'; while the other camp will think that the citadel has been betrayed to the enemy. For years the Ritschlian theology has been popularly known as 'the modern.' The Germans never apply the term to the counterpart of our pantheistic 'New Theology.' Besides articles by Herrmann and Traub, which I have not seen, dealing with Theodor Kaftan's *Modern Theology of the Old Faith*, the movement, as a whole, has been subjected to at least two detailed and searching criticisms from the Ritschlian side. From the standpoint of the Ritschlian Left—the so-called *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule*—Bousset in the *Theologische Rundschau* (August 1906 to January 1907) finds that Kaftan's 'Old Faith' is a mixture of old and new which have not yet assimilated one another, while his 'Modern Theology' has the same fault of placing discordant elements side by side without welding them together into one consistent whole. Seeberg's is throughout a theology of compromise, dominated by the endeavour to carry over as much as possible of the old dogma into the modern world. 'He loves to paint in indistinct colours, the definite lines varnish, and in this magical enchanted twilight the forms of the old dogmas are lost, and cease to offend the eye.' Others more at home in such matters are welcome to determine how far such ideas are 'positive,' but this mediating theology of Seeberg's certainly marks no real advance, and promises no fresh light. Grützmacher is little more than an echo—a less liberal and more polemical Seeberg. 'By his own admission his work is patchwork, and, in the situation in which we are placed, patchwork is of no use.'

Bousset, like Beth, deals separately with Theodor Kaftan, Seeberg, and Grützmacher. Schian follows a different method. His articles, just reprinted in a small volume of 121 pages, bear the titles, 'The Principles of the Modern Positive Theology,' 'The Christology of the Modern Positive Theology,' 'How does the Modern Positive Theology reach its Christological Affirmations?' 'Reinhold Seeberg's *Fundamental Truths* and the Ecclesiastical Situation.'

These articles of Schian's seem to me quite as able as Bousset's, and more instructive. They are,

besides, much more friendly in tone, but I do not know that in judgment there is any substantial difference. So far as I can infer Schian's general standpoint, he represents the older Ritschlianism.

The criticisms directed against 'Modern Positive Theology' from the 'Positive' side I know only at second hand. The strict orthodoxy of Greifswald finds Seeberg grievously in error in reference to his doctrine of Scripture, his Christology, and his view of the Atonement. But for some points of minor importance, according to Hermann Cremer, he would pass for a pupil of (Julius) Kaftan's. 'His views are not Lutheran, or Reformed, or Pietistic. They represent a modern sentimentalism, and furnish not a counterpart to Harnack's *Essence of Christianity*, but a companion piece.' One notable and learned representative of this school, however, the late Professor Zöckler, in his posthumous history of Apologetics, lets Seeberg down gently, finding that, at any rate, the heterodox is less in evidence than what is sound and Scriptural.

Such, then, has been the reception accorded to 'Modern Positive Theology' in the land of its

birth. I think it must be admitted that Seeberg is neither a Schleiermacher nor a Ritschl. But he is a theologian of vast learning and great literary power, thoroughly in earnest in his desire to be both modern and true in the fullest measure to the faith received from the men of old. He is, moreover, the direct theological heir of Thomasius and Frank, and as such his views are likely to find admittance where the great constructive spirits of modern theology would knock in vain. In view of its origin as the work of a 'positive' theologian, compelled by stress of circumstances to become, in some measure at least, 'modern,' and of its theological significance as a movement towards Modernism from within the citadels of tradition, I think that some profit may accrue to the readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES from an examination of 'Modern Positive Theology.' So with the editor's indulgence I hope to deal in a short series of articles with Modern Positive Theology in its attitude to Scripture and ecclesiastical dogma, in its Christology, and in its relation to the general theological movement and the practical needs of our day.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF ST. LUKE.

LUKE XXIII. 43.

'And he said unto him, Verily I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise.'—R.V.

EXPOSITION.

'And he said unto him.'—This is our Lord's second word from the Cross, and it is recorded only by St. Luke.

'Verily I say unto thee.'—As usual, this introduces something of special importance, or beyond expectation, cf. Lk 4²⁴ 12³⁷ 18¹⁷, 29 21³².—PLUMMER.

'To-day.'—Without an intermediate (1) state of unconsciousness, or (2) Purgatory.—ADENEY.

AN unexpected boon,—for the crucified often lingered in agony for more than two days.—FARRAR.

'Shalt thou be with me.'—Not merely in My company (σὺν ἐμοί), but sharing with Me (μετ' ἐμοῦ). The promise implies the continuance of consciousness after death. If the dead are unconscious, the assurance to the robber that he will be with Christ after death would be empty of consolation.—PLUMMER.

'In Paradise.'—The word, said to be of Persian origin,

is used in various senses in Scripture: (1) a park or pleasure-ground (Neh 2⁸, Cant 4¹³, Ec 2⁵); (2) the garden of Eden (Gn 2⁸⁻¹⁰, 15, 16 3¹⁻³, 8-10 etc.); (3) Abraham's bosom, *i.e.* the resting-place of the souls of the just until the resurrection (the meaning here); (4) a region in heaven, perhaps identical with 'the third heaven' (2 Co 12⁴). It is doubtful whether 'the paradise of God' (Rev 2⁷) is the same as (3) or (4) or is yet a fifth use. By His use of the word, Jesus neither confirms nor corrects Jewish beliefs on the subject. He assures the penitent that He will do far more than remember him at some unknown time in the future: this very day He will have him in His company in a place of security and bliss.—PLUMMER.

THE SERMON.

Jesus and the Individual.

By the Rev. W. M. Clow, B.D.

It is true that Jesus loved the whole world and died for it; it is true that He came to found His kingdom and build His Church, but His supreme

interest was always in the individual. It was only through a moral and spiritual change in the individual that His ideal of His kingdom and Church could ever be realized. So we find that individuals absorb Him all through life; and even in the midst of His passion He speaks those words to the first believer in His cross, 'To-day shalt thou be with me.'

1. Let us consider this supreme interest in the individual; first, as *a revelation of the mind and heart of God*. In the Old Testament it is not the individual but 'the people of God' as a concrete unity whom God leads and teaches, with whom He made His covenant. Now and again some privileged soul beheld the face of God, but the ordinary man did not dare to think that he was of consequence to God. We know that in Old Testament times God did care for the humblest soul, but it is plain that the Israelites found it inconceivable. With the New Testament in our hands, do we believe that He cares for us with our obscure lives and petty passions? Who has not felt prayer to be beset with difficulty when we consider the transcendence and almightiness of God? But the difficulty is one of imagination rather than of reason. God is a personality and therefore a thinking and devising will. He is thought of most surely as love—love which is not weakened by exercise and which is always individual. Then it becomes sweet reasonableness to believe that God cares for every soul. Illustrations of this truth, that only greatness can individualize, abound. Is not the power to master and manage details the test of a great mind? Take a great mind—like Kepler's, looking up into the myriad multitude of stars, or like Shakespeare's, making every servitor in his drama maintain his place—and you find it moving with an easy mastery over bewildering details.

2. Notice, secondly, that the supreme care of Jesus for the individual is *a revelation of the value of each human life*. That man has a spiritual and immortal life consciously within him—that is what gives value to his life. Bring this home in the simplest way. In the early hours of this morning an obscure man surrendered his energy and passed into death. The years of toil and drudgery and desire are all spent. He will be carried to a grave as obscure as was his life. But that man is of infinite value to God, and his life is intimately known to God. And this obscurity is changed into glory.

3: In the third place, notice that the supreme care of Jesus for the individual is *a revelation of the most imperative duty of the individual soul*. Duty is response to God. If God so loves the individual, the imperative business of life is to love God in return. In the old evangelical language the only certain duty of life is to save the soul. And that, not for the sake of the individual only, but for the sake of the commonweal. One by one we are born again, and one by one enter the kingdom, which is built up of individuals who have made response to God.

The Second Word from the Cross.

By the Rev. A. G. Mortimer, D.D.

The first word from the Cross showed us love manifesting itself in *prayer* for the souls of others; this second word shows us love manifesting itself in *works* for the souls of others. Our Lord was asked by the thief for remembrance in His kingdom, but He at once gives him a share in that kingdom for eternity—the kingdom which He was to win at so great a cost.

Our Lord by His attitude to this thief draws a clear distinction between philanthropy and charity—the love of men's bodies and the love of their souls. To-day the philanthropists are an increasingly large class. This being so, should not Christians leave the task of caring for men's bodies to them, and confine themselves to ministering to men's souls—ministering to their bodies only as a means of reaching their souls? When the robber said, 'Lord, remember me,' he was suffering intense agony. What, then, ought our Lord to have done according to the views of philanthropy? Surely He ought to have taken him down from the cross, staunched his wounds and deadened his pain. In that sense our Lord was no philanthropist. He allowed the thief to suffer because suffering is one of the greatest blessings of life—when it is borne as the penitent thief bore his, as the due reward of sin. He left him on the cross to die, but He saved his soul. His method was not temporal alleviation of pain, but the eternal redemption of the soul—not philanthropy, but charity.

Let me now make a few practical suggestions of ways in which we can follow our Lord's example in manifesting our love by works for others. It is clear that our Lord, by sharing His kingdom with

a robber, set before us the duty of sharing with others our kingdom—that over which we have rule, our time, our money, our talents.

To what extent must we do this? Oh, let us be generous. With regard to time let us consider how much time we spend selfishly on ourselves, and how much we waste. With regard to money, a tenth God required of the Jew, and this proportion at least the Church requires of her children. Indeed, this is a *debt* due to God. Our *gifts* do not begin until after that debt has been paid. With regard to the direction which our giving takes, let us not be like those who give large fortunes to the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, or to found a home for cats, but will not give anything to prevent the ruin and loss of souls. Let us remember our Lord's principle—not philanthropy, but charity.

ILLUSTRATIONS.

THE miraculous thing is not the pardon, but the ripeness, of the malefactor. There are flowers in the American prairies that spring up in a single night. When they do spring up, they are entitled to all the *benefits* of a flower; it is no *miracle* that they drink the sunshine. The whole wonder lies in this quick springing, in the acceleration of this development. So it is with this malefactor. The marvel is the ripeness of his faith. You say he received a quicker reward than Peter. He deserved it. He displayed exactly that kind of faith which Peter in the garden had failed to reach—faith in Christ's power on the *Cross*. His spiritual life was *born* on Calvary; he was the first leaf of that winter tree. He came to Jesus in His human poverty. He came to Him when, to the eye of sense, He was a dying man. He came to Him when He had been divested of every robe which meant royalty; denuded of every badge which declared Him to be a King. And yet, in that hour he perceived His royalty. He detected the gold beneath the dust; he recognized the kingdom through the cloud. In the absence of all visible glory, in the presence of all that suggested humiliation, this man discerned a regal majesty, a power to which in death a human soul might pray. And Jesus discerned in *him* the presage of His coming kingdom—the first-fruits of a great communion in which the voices of a responsive multitude should break the solitude of the Son of man.—MATHESON'S *Studies of the Portrait of Christ*.

'I HAVE said farewell to everything in this life,' answered the stranger stoutly. 'I have given up my former name, family, everything. I have no idea what to do, if I live, unless I can work here.'

'Pears ter me that depends entirely on yer own state o' mind,' replied Pa Gladden. 'If ye hain't got any hanker arter yerself in the past, it strikes me thet ye air jes erbout in the state o' thet thief that war hangin' on the cross next ter God's Son. Don't ye remember them solemn words:

"Ter-night thou shalt be with me in Paradise"? God has p'intedly saved ye by redeemin' love fer a good life. Ye've been hung on your cross of affliction an' sufferin' ontill the old Adam orter be plumb dead in ye this minute.' A look of incredulity crossed the pallid face.

'Is there any life left for me?'

'A life o' right-doin',' spoke Pa Gladden strongly. 'It air plain ter see thet ye've hed uncommon chances, an' ye ain't done one thing with them. Now thet ye ain't got any chance at all, mebbe yer speerit wull rise an' climb out o' its encumberin' shell.'—*Pa Gladden*, by ELIZABETH CHERRY WALTZ.

At length

The pale, glad lips have breathed the trembling prayer,
'O Lord, remember me!' The hosts of God,
With wistful angel-faces, bending low
Above their dying King, were surely stirred
To wonder at the cry. Not one of all
The shining host had dared to speak to Him
In that dread hour of woe, when Heaven and Earth
Stood trembling and amazed; yet, lo! the voice
Of one who speaks to Him, who dares to pray,
'O Lord, remember me!' A sinful man
May make his pitiful appeal to Christ,
The Sinner's Friend, where angels dare not speak;
And sweetly from the dying lips that day
The answer came.

Oh, strange and solemn joy
Which broke upon the fading face of him
Who there received the promise: 'Thou shalt be
In Paradise this night, this night with Me.'
And thus the Lord fulfilled His word. He spake
Of giving rest, and on the bitter Cross
He gave the promised rest. O Christ, the King!
We also wander on the desert hills,
Though haunted by Thy call, returning sweet
At morn and eve: we will not come to Thee
Till Thou hast nailed us to some bitter cross,
And *made* us look on Thine: and driven at last
To call on Thee with trembling and with tears—
Thou lookest down in love, upbraiding not
And promising the kingdom!

Thus it was

That day on Calvary.

'Ezekiel, and other Poems,' by BARBARA
MILLER MACANDREW.

'With me in Paradise.' It was a Sabbath afternoon. I had taken my little boy of four summers for a walk to our village cemetery to see the grave of an infant recently buried there.

We were walking homeward hand in hand, and had been silent for some minutes, when the little lad said, 'Papa, when you die and go to heaven, will you take me too?' Somewhat in wonder at his artless question, I replied, 'Why, my son?' He gripped my hand more closely as he looked up with the light of love in his eye, and said tenderly, 'Cause I want to go *with you*.'

What answer could I make him? To go with me! Then he would not fear. There would be no darkness or mystery where I was. Heaven would be home for him if I

were there. There flashed upon my mind the Saviour's words, 'Thou shalt be *with me* in Paradise.' Ah, little son, what a lesson you have taught me! what a flood of light you have thrown upon my faith and hope and love in Him who says to all His sons, 'Thou shalt be with me in Paradise!' Where thou art, O Christ, there is heaven for me. Why should I shrink from death or fear the power of its darkness?—W. M'DONALD.

FOR REFERENCE.

Benson (R. M.), *The Final Passover*, iii. Part II. 280.
 Brent (C. H.), *The Consolations of the Cross*, 15.
 Clow (W. M.), *In the Day of the Cross*, 253.
 Creighton (M.), *Lessons from the Cross*, 88.
 Davies (J. A.), *Seven Words of Love*, 12.
 Gammack (A. J.), *Good Friday*, 13.
 Gay (J.), *Seven Sayings from the Cross*, 33.
 Hutton (R. E.), *Crown of Christ*, i. 457.

Ingram (A. F. W.), *Addresses in Holy Week*, 66.
 Jerdan (C.), *For the Lord's Table*, 194.
 Lowrie (W.), *Gaudium Crucis*, 20.
 Lyttelton (W. H.), *Man after Death*, 3.
 Macleod (D.), *The Sunday Home Service*, 87.
 Mortimer (A. G.), *Jesus and the Resurrection*, 18.
 Mortimer (A. G.), *The Chief Virtues of Man*, 31.
 Moule (H. C. G.), *Thoughts for the Sundays of the Year*, 179.
 Newman (W.), *Meditations on the Seven Last Words*, 31.
 Nicoll (W. R.), *Seven Words from the Cross*, 15.
 Nugee (G.), *The Words from the Cross*, 34.
 Stevens (H.), *Sermon Outlines*, 132.
 Whiton (J. M.), *Beyond the Shadow*, 71.
 Vaux (J. E.), *Sermon Notes*, 3rd ser. 26.
Christian World Pulpit, vol. xiii. 2331 (S. Minton); xviii. 376 (C. Stanford); xxii. 76 (A. Scott); xlv. 113 (G. Body).
Church Pulpit Year Book, iii. (1906), 78; iv. (1907) 72.
Sunday Evenings in Methodism, 177 (J. Mee).

Recent Foreign Theology.

*The New Study of Gnosticism.*¹

THE data for a scientific study of Gnosticism have been vastly increased within recent years. Thanks to the industry of many able scholars, it has become possible to estimate the various patristic sources in something like their true relative value. New fragments of Gnostic documents have come to light, and the *Pistis Sophia* and Books of Jêu have been thoroughly edited. Above all, modern research has thrown a flood of light on the whole subject of religious syncretism in the first century. The different elements which entered into Gnosticism can now in some measure be analysed; and the process whereby they were fused together and connected with Christianity has ceased to be wholly unintelligible.

Professor Bousset has many qualifications for attempting a solution of the outstanding problems of Gnosticism, in the light of the new data. His previous studies in Oriental mythology and speculation have given him an almost unrivalled command of the relevant material. He possesses in a high degree the faculties of judgment and insight, without which it is perilous to wander in the Gnostic labyrinth. The lucidity of thought and

language, which is so marked a feature in all his writings, is peculiarly welcome in the present book. The subject of Gnosticism has obscurities enough of its own; and we cannot afford to study it in a hazy or confused exposition. Bousset is always clear. He often succeeds in removing a difficulty by nothing else than a plain, orderly statement of the facts.

The book is divided into eight chapters, each of them dealing with some problem of Gnosticism which has hitherto baffled inquiry. Bousset looks for a solution by regarding Gnosticism as only one phase in a much wider movement. Instead of confining himself to a single period or a single class of sources, he takes account of the whole movement, from its beginnings in pre-Christian times to its final outcome in Manichæanism and Mandæanism. His investigation leads him to the general result that there was no intrinsic relation between Gnosticism and Christianity. Gnostic speculation had its origin in the attempt to graft one religious system on an earlier one; but these two religions were not Christianity and Greek or Oriental Paganism. The earlier religion was that of Babylonia, and the later one that of Persia. About the time of Alexander, the Persian religion began to displace the Babylonian, and what had hitherto been the supreme divinities suffered a process of degradation. The seven planetary gods

¹ *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis*. Von Wilhelm Bousset. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1907. Glasgow: F. Bauermeister.)

(headed by Ialdabaoth or Saturn) became the Archons of the lower, material world; while over against them was the Zoroastrian world of Light, the Pleroma of later theory. In its origin, therefore, Gnosticism was purely dualistic, and this was its essential character all through its history, as we can see from its final outcome in the Manichæan system. But in the West the influence of Greek philosophy reacted on the original dualism. Basilides, and in a more marked degree Valentinus, sought to deduce the lower world from the higher, in the interests of a philosophical monism. The doctrine of emanations, however, was a later accretion, and had no organic relation to Gnosticism proper.

Bousset passes in review the various Gnostic conceptions which seem to be borrowed from Christianity; and endeavours to prove, in each instance, that a Christian colouring was imparted to ideas which really belonged to some much earlier faith. Thus the Gnostic 'Saviour' was simply the hero who appears in many Oriental myths as conquering the powers of darkness; this mythical figure, perhaps originally the sun-god, was artificially combined with the historical Jesus. The strange rôle which Gnosticism assigns to the Spirit is likewise to be explained from the survival of traditions relating possibly to Mithra, the god of the middle air. Even the anti-Jewish attitude of Gnosticism may have originated in a time before the contact with Christianity. Bousset is inclined to connect it with the rivalry of Jews and Phœnicians in the days of Judas Maccabæus. He maintains that, in any case, the doctrine of an inferior malign Power had already been fully developed before there was any thought of associating it with the God of the Old Testament.

A large part of the investigation is occupied with the mysterious figure of Sophia, around whose fall and redemption all the Gnostic theories revolve. Bousset concludes that Sophia is ultimately identical with the *Μήνηρ*—the queen of heaven or mother of the gods. The myth of this divinity became fused with that of the primordial man (the *Gayomard* of Persian speculation), who takes a central place in Manichæanism, although in Gnosticism he falls out of sight, owing to his absorption into Sophia. It is due to this double derivation that the figure of Sophia is in some Gnostic systems duplicated—one Sophia retaining

her rank in the Pleroma, while the other falls. Originally the *Μήνηρ* had absolutely no place in the world of Jewish or Christian thought; but an analogy to her was found in the Wisdom of the Old Testament, whose name she henceforth assumed.

In a brief review it is only possible to indicate two or three of the more important suggestions in Bousset's book, omitting altogether the weighty arguments by which they are supported. No doubt, in his explanation of many of the details of Gnostic theory, there is much that is conjectural; but it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that Bousset has proved his main thesis. He has shown that the origins of Gnosticism are to be sought in a mingling of Oriental mythologies which had taken place before the Christian era, and that the speculations thus derived were not essentially modified by Christianity. The book lies open to criticism on the side of its omissions rather than of its contents. Some notice, for instance, might have been taken of de Faye's argument, based on a detailed examination of the sources, that the earlier Christian Gnosticism was of a simple and semi-orthodox type, and gave place very gradually to the full-blown mythological systems. It seems to us, also, that Bousset has passed over too lightly the influence of Greek speculation on Gnosticism. Admitting everything he says about the origin of the Gnostic movement, we may still maintain that it entirely changed its character when a philosophical value came to be impressed on the crude mythological figures. A still more serious defect is the absence of all appreciation of the religious significance of Gnosticism. The Gnostic thinkers may have succeeded very imperfectly in their attempt to combine Oriental tradition with the principles of Christianity. But we cannot believe that the whole movement was merely artificial. It must have been created by the sense of needs and aspirations which were not wholly satisfied by the orthodox creed. We know, even by the admissions of their adversaries, that there was a genuine and sometimes an intense religious life among the Gnostic Christians. Bousset has told us nothing about this inward spirit of the Gnostic movement, as distinguished from its fantastic external forms. Doubtless it was his object to confine his inquiry to a few debated points concerning Gnostic origins; but we leave his book with the desire that he would supplement it with

another in which he would explain the essential motive and import of Gnosticism.

E. F. SCOTT.

Prestwick.

Tobit and Aḥikar.¹

THE two essays named below are brought into one Beiheft zur *Z.A.T.W.* because each of them has something to say concerning the Achiacharos of Tobit (1^{21f.} 2¹⁰ 11¹⁸ 14^{10f.}). Dr. Müller does not write at great length on this point, his chief concern being with other questions. Professor Smend agrees in the main with his treatment of the Achiacharos passages, and devotes himself chiefly to certain investigations suggested by that story of Aḥikar which of late years has excited so much interest.

In the first essay we find a useful discussion of the various recensions of the Greek text of Tobit. These are divided into three classes, a shorter, represented by the uncials A and B, Ven 1 and most cursives, a longer, given in the Sinai MS., and an intermediate one, found in 44, 106, 107. Müller concludes that, so far as the subject-matter is concerned, the longer recension stands farthest from the primary Greek translation, but that the language of the shorter recension has sustained more alterations. A good illustration of the use made of the comparison of the texts is supplied by To 6¹². From the shorter text Müller shows that ἀνὴρ ἔρεπος, and not, as is commonly supposed, Raguel, is the subject of ὀφειλήσει θάνατον. As to the contents of the book, the essayist holds that it is based on an earlier one, of non-Jewish origin, nearer in form and substance to the widely diffused folk-tales which treat of 'The Grateful Dead Man,' who, rising again, secures for his benefactor a rich wife, after her former bridegrooms have been destroyed by a demon. 'It is a striking fact that in the Book of Tobit the reward is given in the first instance, not to the man who has buried the dead, but to his son. The pious custom of the father leads at first to the loss of his eyesight, which, however, is eventually restored. Moreover, the close similarity of the names Tobit and Tobias suggests the idea

that father and son were originally one person, and were divided into two so as to place a Jewish Tobias alongside the probably foreign Tobit. And it is possible that the blind Tobit had at first nothing to do with the Tobit who buried the dead. For Tobit's blindness is brought into connexion with these interments in a peculiarly artificial fashion.'² The Persian name Asmodeus and the dog of Tobias also compel us to think of a foreign source. And the same would have to be said of the Achiacharos passages were it not that these are interpolations. The reference to Achiacharos in the dying speech of Tobit (14^{10f.}) is altogether inappropriate, and this, with the other passages in which the name appears, can be removed from the text without creating a gap. Müller explains the differences betwixt those passages and the now extant Aḥikar story by supposing that the interpolator had another form of the legend before him.³ He dates Tobit shortly before the Maccabean struggle, because it contains no teaching as to a future life, and no evidence of fanatical hatred of the heathen, as also on account of its literary characteristics. He locates the author in Palestine, and maintains that he wrote in Hebrew or Aramaic.

Until now it seems to have almost escaped notice that there is a remarkable similarity between the fables at the end of the Aḥikar story and the fables concerning animals, amongst those which go by the name of Æsop. Smend takes great pains to demonstrate the priority of the former. But the reader has the opportunity of judging for himself, as the parallel pairs are in each case given. Certainly in the one case⁴ on which most stress is laid, the form in Æsop might be derived from the other, but the one in Aḥikar cannot be explained from the Greek. The way, too, in which the material is arranged in the combined Life and Fables of Æsop shows conclusively that the Greek editor had the Aḥikar legend to work on. A Greek version of it must have been current in the first century of our era. It and all the subsequent translations, Arabic, Armenian, Ethiopic, Slavic, rest ultimately on an Aramaic form. But there are so many allusions to the Old Testament, especially to the Wisdom Literature, as to compel the conclusion that the work is of Jewish origin, dating from about 200 B.C. And further still, the theme, which is the rivalry of two viziers; the

¹ Beiheft zur *Z.A.T.W.* 'Beiträge zur Erklärung und Kritik des Buches Tobit,' von Johannes Müller. 'Alter und Herkunft des Achikar-Romans und seine Verhältniss zu Æsop,' von Rudolf Smend. Giessen: Töpelmann, 1908.

² P. 10. ³ But cf. Smend, on p. 119. ⁴ P. 81.

names Ahikar and Nadan; with other tokens, imply a still earlier narrative of non-Jewish character.

The above summary will show that some of the positions taken up by our two authors are opposed to those which have been held by previous writers. The new ground is fortified by a considerable mass of fresh material, which is disposed in such a way as to challenge attention and interest.

JOHN TAYLOR.

Winchcombe.

Harnack on the Acts of the Apostles.¹

THIS monograph assumes and applies the critical principles laid down in the author's previous study of Luke the Physician. It is characterized by the same independent research into details, the same power of historical appreciation, and the same robust contempt for recent vagaries of criticism upon the Lucan writings. Too many essays on Acts are steps aside. Harnack's is a step forward. His direction at any rate is right.

The first chapter, on the chronological data, substantially reproduces the essay which has been already noticed in the pages of this magazine (pp. 250-252). The second chapter, on the geographical and local data (pp. 54-100), which is crowded with exegetical material, incidentally denies that Luke supports the South Galatian hypothesis (pp. 60, 90), divides Paul's missions into two (13-14, 15⁸⁶⁻²¹⁷, so von Dobschütz), not into three phases (p. 87), calls attention to Luke's interest in the houses where Paul stayed (pp. 95 f.), and sums up afresh in favour of the we-sections and the whole book being due to the same author. The third chapter (pp. 101-110), on Luke's treatment of persons, is followed by a fourth upon the miracles and ecstatic phenomena of the history (pp. 111-130), which comes to close quarters with the real problems of the book. Luke's repetition of popular tales in the first fifteen chapters is ascribed to the fact that he had authorities for that period who were less critical than himself, but whom he respected too much to ignore. Harnack, as usual, will not have recourse, except

on the direst compulsion, to any source-criticism in order to explain these legends of the primitive Palestinian Church. Luke must have got them from people like Philip and his daughters. The story of Ananias and Sapphira may have been modelled on passages like Lv 10 and Jos 7, but it is not, as Pfeiderer thinks, 'an allegorical fable.' The account of the Ascension (pp. 126 f.) in 1¹⁻¹² represents a third stage of the legend which Luke picked up after he had written the third Gospel, where its second stage or phase is reproduced. When compared with the Acts of Paul or of John, however, Luke's history is remarkably reserved in its predilection for supernatural tales; only three miracles are associated with Jerusalem in Ac 1-15, and in the we-source, where Luke is writing independently of tradition, the character of the miracles rises.

The heart of the volume is in the fifth and sixth chapters, where Harnack develops his own theory of the composition of Acts. Local tradition is its keynote. The second part contains practically no source, beyond the we-journal of Luke himself, but the first half is analysed into A (3¹⁻⁵¹⁶ 8⁵⁻⁴⁰ 9³¹⁻¹¹¹⁸ 12¹⁻²³), and B (2. 5¹⁷⁻⁴²), with AJ an Antioch-Jerusalem source in 6¹⁻⁸⁴ 11¹⁹⁻³⁰ 12²⁵⁻¹⁵³⁵. A goes back possibly to Philip, B (an inferior source) need not have lain before Luke in written form at all, while Silas may be conjectured to stand behind the contents of AJ. The first chapter of the book Harnack leaves out of account as one of the latest and least reliable sections (p. 148 note, pp. 182 f.). Where Luke is best, in the earlier part, is in his reproduction of traditions connected with Syrian Antioch and Cæsarea, for which, as his own acquaintance with Palestine was small, he was indebted to one or two primitive Christians.

The main features of the essay are thus twofold. (i.) Harnack tries to account for the differences of historical level in Acts by going behind Luke to his sources, or rather his authorities. This process sometimes throws a disc of light upon dark corners, but it is not always convincing. It implies that Luke sometimes accepted, against his better judgment, tales consecrated by primitive Palestinian tradition, and Harnack's psychological explanation of the historian's mind fails to satisfy the reader at this point. He has handicapped himself further by (ii.) an undue scepticism of written sources. As a protest against the extra-

¹ *Die Apostelgeschichte.* Untersuchungen von A. Harnack. Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Neue Testament, Heft 3. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1908. M.5.

gance of much analytic criticism of Acts, his method is timely and valuable. But he has plied it to excess. Thus the problem of the Pentecost story is at least as explicable, on some source-hypothesis, as upon the rather vague theory of Harnack (p. 125) that Luke used his own freedom here. The ordinary sources postulated by critics are as sadly reduced by Harnack as King Lear's returns of knights, but reduction in this direction may be carried too far.

On matters of detail, one significant change of opinion is to be noted. With charming candour,

Harnack admits that G. Resch has now converted him to believe that the original form of the decree in Ac 15 lacked *πρὸς πάντων*, and was a moral set of regulations (pp. 188 f.). He gives detailed, if not persuasive, reasons for his new faith.

The monograph, it is needless to say, starts a dozen questions for every one, which it solves, but its sane, vigorous pages will help to dominate the criticism of Acts for years to come. Their penetration and first-hand results are a perpetual stimulus to the reader.

JAMES MOFFATT.

Broughtly Ferry.

The Pilgrim's Progress.

BY THE REV. JOHN KELMAN, M.A., D.D., EDINBURGH.

The Escape from Doubting Castle.

If elsewhere John Bunyan is indebted for adventurous suggestions to Sir Bevis of Southampton, here, at least, he invents his own story. Nothing in the earlier romance is more racy than the story of Bevis' escape from his prison in Damascus. He watches for the descent of a man with his food, kills him, climbs up the rope, and, killing the two jailers, rushes forth shouting that Bevis had escaped, and putting every one in such a panic that Bevis actually does escape! It is a characteristic and tempting adventure. But Bunyan's genius is at once simpler and more subtle. And we find in this one more effect of writing with his 'eye on the object'—true, point for point, to experience. There is another story, of a prisoner who lay languishing for long in his dungeon, watching the spiders and scratching inscriptions on the walls in the most approved fashion, until one day—well, he just opened the door and walked out! That is the true story of the escape of souls from their imprisonment, and John Bunyan's variant upon it only adds the Christian's secret of deliverance—prayer and promise, which reveal to the soul its freedom.

First there comes *Prayer*, yet not until the Saturday night. It would be interesting to know how far this touch is intentional, 'on Saturday about midnight they *began* to pray.' If it is implied that they had not prayed earlier, no one familiar with *Grace Abounding*, or, indeed, with

his own heart, will be surprised. 'But oh!' says Bunyan, 'twas hard work for me now to have the face to pray to this Christ for mercy, against whom I had thus vilely sinned: 'twas hard work, I say, to offer to look Him in the face, against whom I had so vilely sinned; and, indeed, I have found it as difficult to come to God by prayer, after backsliding from Him, as to do any other thing.'

Then comes *Promise*, and in close connexion with the prayer. For, as one commentator (MacGuire) says, 'Every prayer is founded on a promise, and every true prayer discovers this foundation.' This prayer is promptly answered by a quickened memory and the discovery of the appropriate promise. The metaphor here is of a key, as formerly it had been of stepping-stones. And, as the stepping-stones were sometimes slippery with the mire of the slough, so here the key does not turn every lock easily. In our nicer modern editions we read that the lock of the iron gate went 'desperately hard.' That is not the word which John Bunyan wrote, but 'damnable hard'—and the expression, too strong for modern ears, was not at all stronger than the experiences of which it was a reminiscence. This backsliding had touched the very promises of God with rust. Well for them that Giant Despair had not stolen the key altogether. Had sceptical distrust left them without any assurance that God had spoken, it would indeed have been all over with their souls. For secular attempts to escape

from that dungeon are but leaden keys, and in these rusty locks they will not turn at all.

Here, then, we have another rescript from much experience, the record of which may be found in all John Bunyan's writings. His *Pilgrim's Progress* begins with the Man with a book, and that book is never out of evidence on any page of it. His *Grace Abounding* is just one long record of thrust and parry between devils' thoughts and texts of Scripture. Dr. Whyte, in his chapter on Giant Despair, gives a fine selection of the promises that helped him most. It is an exercise that will richly repay its trouble, for any one to complete the list for himself from that extraordinary little book. Such a list of promises may stand us all in good stead in some of those undevotional and desperate times when our own Bible gets out of print, and we can find nothing in it for ourselves.

So, on the Sunday morning, all was changed. It was in strong contrast from the mornings of late days, which brought the Giant with his club to them. They 'had endorsed Despair's accusation, but it was a forged bill.' Despair is powerless against a Sunday morning heart. It was with a thought similar to this that Goethe brought in the chorus of disciples while Faust gloomed apart in his study on Easter morning. Had he been out among them, entering into the common gladness of the day, his story would have been very different. Yet is this 'glorious morning face,' of which Stevenson sings so beautifully in his *Celestial Surgeon*, not wholly out of the reach of will. With the promises of God in his bosom, it only needs energy, and such energy as any man may exert, to achieve it.

But there is here also a delicate word spoken in honour of the Sunday. The passage reminds us of Herbert's familiar and beautiful lines, 'How fresh, O Lord, how sweet and clean, Are thy returns,' and of his still more famous Sunday hymn:

O Day, most calm, most bright, . . .
The week were dark but for thy light.

We are reminded, too, that it was a sermon on the observance of the Sabbath day that formed the earliest and perhaps the most critical of all Bunyan's own spiritual turning-points. The Puritan Sabbath has been subjected to much ridicule, and Watts' line about that heaven where 'sabbaths have no end' has provoked some rather

obvious merriment. But there was something in those Sundays of an earlier generation which our emancipated times will find it hard to match. When,

In dwellings of the righteous
Is heard the melody
Of joy and health,

that 'grave sweet melody' will sing its tune for ever to the heart that once has heard it.

The Sequel.

Doubting Castle was demolished by Christiana's troop, and an old picture in Bagster's edition shows it coming down with a vengeance, the artist having caught the spirit of the book more than the principles of engineering. As a matter of historic fact, this demolition has actually taken place. The Doubting Castle of Puritan days is almost as much a thing of the past as the *Mysteries of Udolpho*. Except for a small percentage of neurotic persons, within and without our lunatic asylums, such instances of violent religious depression are rare.

That is very good and natural, the result of happier times and a healthier habit of thought corresponding to them. Yet unquestionably it is not well that so many of our generation find it difficult or impossible to form any adequate conception, or to feel any adequate shame, of sin. It has been finely said that 'The sin of a soul that is conscious of God is the wrong done by that soul to all which it reveres.' It cannot be safe to lose the realization of the enormity of such wrong. The life of one who values and needs the companionship of that nearest of friends, a good conscience, must ever be a vastly nobler thing than that of one who can reconcile himself to do without it and still not be miserable. In his clever parody, Nathaniel Hawthorne has spoken but the truth when he described the renovated castle, slight and dangerous, which our Flimsy-faith has erected on the site of the ancient fortress. In every way, despair was better than the insensate silliness which has replaced it. If there be some who have been tormented with an evil spirit of hopeless sorrow for their sins, they may take comfort in the answer of an old German theologian to a child. The child had asked him, 'Why does not God slay the devil?' and the answer was, 'From love to thee.'

In the pillar which the Pilgrims set up, with its

warning to those that followed, we see Christian's incurable, undiscourageable need and impulse to evangelize. Neither the shame of his own late fall, nor the joy of regaining the highway, can hinder him from preaching to others and warning them. For deep in the man's heart there is a great compassion. It is a dangerous world, and he remembers other travellers in it, and sets up his pillar. Of lighthouses it has been finely said, 'It is compassion that lights their lanterns round our coast, the nation's sense of danger.' And the spiritual lighthouses also—the confessions and warnings of good men—are due to the same source.

The author of Part III., forgetful of the text about removing his neighbour's landmark, has appropriated this pillar for his own uses, in that Pillar named History, hard by the cave of Pope and Pagan, which is looked after by the middle-aged man Reformation. It must be confessed that the passage is a striking one, and Bunyan would hardly have grudged it even to so shameless a successor.

The Delectable Mountains.

It would be an interesting exercise to draw, from what materials the book affords, a contour line showing the elevations of the various points of this journey—its valleys and plains, hills and mountains. Such a line would, we may presume, show a broken but yet in the main persistent ascent. From each point, some higher and further point is visible, luring on the eye and foot. These mountains, for instance, were visible from the Palace Beautiful; and what the eye then saw, the foot now gains.

Thus, as in *Paracelsus*, the way is shortened by the assuring vision of future truth and experience. So the long journey is broken up into manageable stages—a great secret in wise pilgrimage. It will be noted that Heaven is not visible from the Palace, but from the Delectable Mountains. It is later life rather than earlier which has heaven for its normal vision. The youth who dreams of heaven, and takes 'O Paradise, O Paradise, I greatly long for rest,' for his favourite hymn, is effeminate. Surely in a world like this there is much for young vitality to do before it talks of rest; earth has claims on it which it were better to fulfil than to dream of heaven. Yet, on the other hand, the progress on this journey is

measured by the visibility of the heavenly light. At first seen faintly, it has now become a vision of clear outlines of a city gate. This is that path of the just that shineth more and more unto the perfect day. And, though in youth the heavenly light is but a far-off point of guidance, yet even then it has its effect, like star-light, on the pilgrim spirit.

These Mountains, like the Palace, are an allegorical representation of the Church, though now in another aspect. The former was elementary and preparatory, this is advanced enlightenment and guidance among spiritual heights. It is the place of Contemplation such as is possible only after ripe experience. Part III., which habitually transfers to another stage of the journey the incidents which it borrows, puts the place of Contemplation in the middle of the Hill Difficulty—surely an unfortunate exchange. Such contemplation, which rests and looks peacefully out upon the facts of this world and the next, is meant to mark a high level of spiritual experience. Froude, writing of ordinary, respectable, right-minded persons, admits that they may be 'amiable in private life, good neighbours, and useful citizens,' but he adds with much insight that they could not 'ever reach the Delectable Mountains, or even be conscious that such mountains exist.' But John Bunyan's holy women of Bedford knew the place: 'I saw as if they were on the sunny side of some high mountain, there refreshing themselves with the pleasant beams of the sun, while I was shivering and shrinking in the cold.' Such experience generally comes with age, if it comes at all. It is not, like the Palace, what the Church can do for one in the moment just after overcoming some great difficulty in a single burst of heroic toil. Its heights are gained, after a lifetime's progress with its many varieties of experiences. It is, transferred to the Church, the mood of *Rabbi ben Ezra*, rather than that of the *Grammarian's Funeral*. Both are high, but this is a restful elevation. Readers will recall that singularly beautiful passage in *The Everlasting Yea* of *Sartor Resartus*: 'To me also, entangled in the enchanted forests, demon-peopled, doleful of sight and sound, it was given, after weariest wanderings, to work out my way into the higher sunlit slopes—of that Mountain which has no summit, or whose summit is in Heaven only.' The passage recalls some fine

lines of Mr. Alfred Austin's, in which he describes the Mountains of Carrara, and which seem ever to remind one of Goethe's words, 'Over all the hills is rest.' But by far the finest and most suggestive thing to read along with this description of the Delectable Mountains, is the last study in Professor George Adam Smith's *Four Psalms* (Psalm 121), in which the physical elevation of hilltops is made to reveal its secret of moral and spiritual elevation to all whose hearts are pure enough to know that secret.

The Shepherds.

Here, as in other passages concerning the Church, ministers are introduced, and a view of the ministry is presented. This aspect is in keeping with the aspect of the Church which the Mountains offer. The Shepherds are feeding their flocks on lofty ground, dealing with high things on the heights above the world. It is an exalted view of the Church and its life—far above all pettiness and gossip of the valley. The air is pure and bracing, and the horizons sweep out wide and free from all narrowness of sectarian or theological exclusiveness.

The conversation is opened by Christian in a series of sharp, short, pertinent questions, which show how fully his late sufferings have recalled him to his alert and keen self again. In their answers the Shepherds show a reserve which at first almost amounts to taciturnity. In Part III. their speech is prosy, and strikes the reader as something between a dull sermon and the advertisement of a watering-place. Here, the answers are enigmatic, throwing back upon the Pilgrims all the responsibilities of the journey, and insisting that all such matters as its length and its safety depend upon themselves. Very different this from the conversation of the people of the Palace, for which there may be several reasons. The Palace dwellers were women, these are men; and the difference between the affectionate tenderness and the earnest truth is characteristic. Again, the Pilgrims are now further on their way, and no longer need such stirrup-cups of comfortable encouragement as they needed earlier. And then, they have sinned lately and very grievously, and are still, in a sense, upon probation—a circumstance borne out further by the fact that warning predominates over any other element contributed by their stay on these mountains.

The whole description is graphic. Such a casual touch as 'leaning upon their staves (as is common with weary pilgrims when they stand to talk with any by the way)' is a curious and unconscious touch of artistry, possible only to one who in his imagination followed his story with his eyes. Similarly the gradual melting from the first austerity to a gentler mood in the Shepherds is a fine achievement in narrative. From answering they turn to questioning, yet not as confessors but as fellow-Christians only. Their very questions are gracious, and convey a compliment on the perseverance of the travellers. Here as elsewhere the important question is, How they had got into the way. But this last question shows the tenderness of the hearts that beat beneath the apparent austerity. In it there is the sad consciousness, so inevitable in any minister's mind, of the small number of those whose pilgrimage fulfils the early promise of its outset. Along with the following paragraphs it would be well to read Professor G. A. Smith's description of the Shepherds' Tents in Psalm 23.

The Three Hills.

Each of the three hills which they now ascend stands for a particular view of life to be had at this ripe stage of Christian experience. Two of the three indicate danger, the third the brilliant spectacle of Heaven—a proportion significant of the grave and serious view of life held by the author, and so often illustrated in his book.

I. Error.

This seems to stand for the moral element in faith or unbelief, which we have already discussed in connexion with Doubting Castle. The hill slopes upward innocently enough, but its further side is a precipice. Men climb that hill to get a wide view of earth and heaven, and the fate of the climbers is a terrible commentary upon a certain kind of wide view. The New Testament instance is of two who had erred out of curiosity as to an apparently trivial, or at least non-vital question—a mere side issue of the faith at best. The doctrine of the Resurrection is a great doctrine, but it lends itself more, perhaps, than most, to over-curious speculation, in which there is always a serious danger to faith. Who does not know of some who have spent their spiritual strength upon such researches, until they have lost touch with

the central matters of the Christian life, and eventually (it may be) have repudiated all faith whatsoever? Once again we are reminded of Bunyan's *Solomon's Temple Spiritualized*—'You have some men who cannot be content to worship in the temple, but must be aloft; no place will serve them but pinnacles, pinnacles; that they may be speaking in and to the air, that they may be promoting their heady notions instead of solid truth; not considering that now they are where the Devil would have them be: they strut upon their points, their pinnacles; but let them look to it, there is difficult standing upon pinnacles; their neck, their soul is in danger. We read, God is in His temple, not upon these pinnacles.' 'What is God doing?' asked such a curious one of an old divine. 'Preparing rods for them that ask such questions,' was his reply.

2. Caution.

There is as little uniformity of method in the naming of these hills as in that of the geographical names of actual mountains. The first and third are named from their own characteristics, the second is named rather from the effect it is meant to produce in the climber. In such matters John Bunyan is too much in earnest about the lessons he has to teach, to take much pains over the niceties of consistent nomenclature. Caution is both a vice and a virtue for Christian men. The venture of faith forbids it, while the dangers of life demand it. No one, *e.g.*, is further from the road to heaven than the calculating, cautious person who has a scheme of his own for making the best of both worlds. Yet here we have passed from dangers of intellect to those of conduct, and the moral life is unquestionably beset with dangers. Describing a rash time of his own life, when he 'was not conscious of the danger and evil of sin,' Bunyan in *Grace Abounding* adds, 'Thus man, while blind, doth wander, but wearie himself with vanity, for he knoweth not the way to the city of God.'

This passage, with its double horror of blindness and death, is described vividly in Dr. Kerr

Bain's second volume—a passage which reminds one in parts of Maeterlinck's *Les Aveugles*. Hawthorne rather infelicitously runs his railway through this graveyard, and nearly has an accident owing to a tombstone maliciously placed upon the rails—an incident whose grotesqueness does not appear to be justified by any very obvious significance.

Who, then, are these victims of rashness, whose fate is this blind and aimless wandering in the precincts of the grave? Surely it was an inspiration that suggested to John Bunyan the device of making the Shepherds describe their own late adventure to the Pilgrims. These victims were Christian and Hopeful, as they might well have been that day, but for the grace of God. It is no wonder they said nothing, but looked through tears upon each other's faces, when they saw others going to perdition by the very same sins and follies from whose consequences God had rescued themselves just before it was too late.

This blindness is often the work rather of Diffidence than of Despair. It is a subtler form of cruelty than the heavy-witted Giant is capable of conceiving. But, if we have read his wife's character aright, we can detect her handiwork in it. Doubt that rises from a deliberate act of sin against conscience, sometimes ends in this. That modern chronic diffidence of any faith, that irrational but mastering habit of unbelief, leads many to just this fate. Lacking the exhilaration of former faith, they wander aimlessly about, in sympathy rather with decay and dead things than with the clean and bright calls of life for useful labour. Hope and result die within them. In helpless cynicism they see nothing, go nowhere, do no useful thing. The *macabre* element inseparable from such decadence is indicated with sure insight in the introduction of the tombs. These are they who 'have said to corruption, Thou art my father; to the worm, Thou art my mother, and my sister. And where is now my hope? As for my hope, who shall see it? They shall go down to the bars of the pit, when our rest together is in the dust.'

The Argument from Experience.

BY PROFESSOR THE REV. J. S. BANKS, D.D., HEADINGLEY COLLEGE, LEEDS.

A GREAT change has taken place in the use made of personal experience as evidence in religion. It has been raised from a subordinate to a principal, almost an exclusive, place. The argument has always been used in some form. It is the old argument, 'One thing I know, that whereas I was blind, now I see.' The phrase used at the Reformation was 'The Witness of the Holy Spirit.' The work of the Spirit in the heart, answering to the Christian experience described in Scripture, attested the truth of Scripture. Protestant Churches especially, in the stress they have laid on the personal element, have always given the argument a high place.

It is a question, however, whether the emphasis given in some schools to this line of argument is not excessive. Formerly the evidence of experience was regarded as the supplement and crown of other witnesses, historical, rational, moral. A living experience is the common characteristic of all Christians, lettered or unlettered, and in the case of multitudes it is the chief, if not the only ground of faith they know. But in our days it is set forth as the only trustworthy ground for all, superseding the evidences which have played so large a part in the past; historical and philosophical defences are discounted. Natural theology is discarded altogether, 'theoretic' reasoning is out of court. It would seem as if great numbers of Christian men, tired of elaborate arguments and casting about for a short and easy method of getting rid of doubt, were disposed to rely entirely on subjective experience. 'That only is true which you have verified in your own heart and life, and that *is* true. Here is rock, all else is sand.' Far be it from us to undervalue the force of the argument, or to suggest doubt to minds at rest. Still it is right to prove all things and to beware of building on too narrow a basis.

The argument is put somewhat as follows: 'I come into the presence of Jesus Christ, seek to understand His secret, open my heart to the influence of His life. As I do so I become conscious of a transforming power at work on me, which I can only regard as divine. God has met me in Christ. Slowly but surely I become a new

man and live a new life, Christ's own spirit takes possession of me.' Then one who has passed through this experience begins to draw inferences. 'This experience is its own verification. I need no other attestation. Reason and history can add nothing to my certainty. I need no doctrine of justification or Christology.' It is obvious that the position, thus briefly sketched, implies much that is not expressed, implies, in fact, much that is disclaimed in words. It is assumed that the picture of Jesus Christ seen in the Gospels is substantially true, indeed historical. Anything that would materially alter the lines of the picture would preclude the possibility of faith and of the experience just described. Change in details might not have this effect, but material change would. We are thus committed to the substantial truth of the evangelical history. And if so, investigation of the ground and environment of the history becomes inevitable. Dr. Dale, in his *Living Christ and the Four Gospels*, puts the case of one who has found a new life in Christ falling into doubt respecting the Gospel history and yet in virtue of his wonderful experience retaining his faith. It is not difficult to understand this. The question which Dr. Dale does not discuss is how any one who began with such doubts could ever arrive at the experience.

Observe also the extraordinary influence ascribed to Jesus Christ. He has become the medium of a moral transformation in me. He has done what God only can do, as God has done it through Him. Then who or what is Christ? What is His relation to God and to man? It is no use forbidding me to ask such questions or to say that these are theoretical matters which are of no practical concern. Intelligent men will not rest in blind faith. They will persist in asking, 'Why should faith in Christ have such unique effects? Like effect, like cause.'

Again, we have been told the effect upon us of steadfast contemplation of the image of Jesus Christ. But other effects are conceivable. What about the impression made on me by the vision of moral perfection? What about the contrast between that lofty ideal seen in realized fact and

my sense of weakness and failure? The teaching of Christ convicts me of sin, but the life of Christ covers me with shame and confusion. In the case of countless multitudes the first effect is to call forth the confession, 'Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord.' The whole story of sin and the need of forgiveness is raised with a force not to be gainsaid. Before the figure of Jesus Christ can have the consoling, elevating influence described, my personal relations to God and law must be put right; in other words, the whole subject of sin and redemption is raised and claims the first consideration. This is the side of religious experience which is ignored or lightly treated by influential schools of thought in our day. Yet it is too serious and fundamental to be swept aside as illusion and exaggeration. When the significance of sin, forgiveness, atonement, and the new birth is minimized, the doctrine of Scripture is mutilated and a new gospel is set up. Justice cannot be done either to Scripture or to the facts of life, if this side of experience is underestimated. If it is included, much more drastic means of amendment are called for. We can think of no more effective means of producing conviction of sin, and the conviction that forgiveness is the first though not the only need of man than the holding up of the life of Jesus Christ before the eyes of men. The Holy Spirit convicts men of sin, righteousness, and judgment in this way. And the result is not a meagre but a rich experience of moral transformation such as is not too strongly described in Paul's Epistles.

One attraction of the new mode of argument is that it is supposed to furnish a simple, unassailable ground of certainty, independent of historical and other difficulties. As we have seen, it does nothing of the kind. We cannot ignore criticism of the historical truth of the Gospels. Our faith grows out of their assumed historicity. To shut our eyes to questions does not settle them. What becomes of the image of Christ, if the history in which it is embodied is unreal or doubtful? We may also point out how heavy a burden is laid by the new method on the individual judgment. It is not easy to see how we could meet the cross-examination brought to bear by scepticism on individual experience. If my faith in God and my whole spiritual life stand or fall with my subjective perceptions and judgments, what becomes of Christian certainty?

The new position also seems to undervalue the claims and authority of reason in the religious life. However reason may have been unduly exalted in some schools of thought, this does not justify its supersession. Faith, if it is to be worthy of God and man, must be rational. The intellect has indefeasible rights. Any doctrine essentially contrary to reason is out of harmony with human nature and the world, and is doomed to failure. While the great Christian teachers of the past have no doubt often gone astray, their record as a whole is a glorious one. The powers of man's intellect have never been more splendidly illustrated than in the service rendered to religion. The long succession of thinkers from Origen to Butler stands in the front rank of the world's benefactors. To abandon the defence of religion in the field of intellect would be an unworthy counsel of despair and a course fatal to man's highest interests. If we were compelled to choose between simple practical faith and a reasoned creed, we should keep the practical and let reason go. But we are shut up to no such choice. We distinguish the one from the other, we keep each in its appropriate place and season, but we hold both. Each would suffer from the absence of the other.

The new method proposed does good service in calling attention to the insufficiency of intellectual grounds of religious faith. That faith can never be matter of demonstration, nor is it desirable that it should be. We do not believe in God as we believe in arithmetic and facts of sense. It is well that scope is left to reason and trust, to personal character and inclination. God desires free, not forced faith. Religion is a practical matter, and in practical matters we are bound to act on the balance of evidence instead of waiting for absolute certainty. Despite all the Hegelians in the world, 'probability is the very guide of life' to such a being as man. At the best, moral certainty is the highest ground we can reach. If we go down to the roots of things, we find that knowledge of every kind starts from faith, mathematical truth from axioms, scientific truth from trust in the senses and the fixed order of the world. Our faith in the laws of nature rests only in part on induction; induction has to be supplemented by faith. In short, human certainty is conditioned and limited. The difference in this respect between religious and other truth is only one of degree. In difficult questions, or where evidence

is evenly balanced, experience gives the casting vote. In the agelong controversy between necessity and freedom speculative reasoning leaves one in doubt, but practical experience speaks with no uncertain voice. The most convinced believer in necessity or determinism never acts upon it. The same may be said of the debate between Protestantism and Romanism. The conflict of argument is interminable. The evidence of history is far easier to appreciate.

A mischievous error is committed when individual experience is made to supersede definition and exact statement. If this only meant that theological and philosophical argument is not needed by the vast majority of believers, good. Or, if the meaning were that only fundamentals need definition, and that secondary questions may be left open, good. But much more is said. Exact statements and even exact ideas of what lies behind the acts and words of Jesus Christ are ruled out as useless. We may not ask, Who and what is Christ Himself? Yet men will ask, and will not be content with a confession of ignorance. We cannot help asking further, If the Church had proceeded from the first on the new basis proposed, what would have been its history? The old theology is cast aside because of its

philosophical associations. Those associations only affect the outward form. Early believers always asserted that the substance of their faith was taken from Scripture, and modern negative teachers endorse the statement. The modern aversion to the association of religion and philosophy is a strange phenomenon, reminding us of the fierce Montanist Tertullian, who cursed philosophy in the name of religion. The general mind of the Church was very different. Witness Origen and Augustine and Aquinas, who loved to trace the analogy between the different departments of the divine working, and who believed that truth in one sphere could not contradict truth in another sphere. I will trust my soul in their company. 'Malo cum Platone errare quam cum istis recte sentire.' English Christianity has no reason to be ashamed on this score. Our best divines have never despised reason. The names of Cudworth, Berkeley, Butler, Martineau would honour any country or age. The Christian apology of our day compares favourably with the best of former times. Best of all, there was never an age when Christianity was more earnest in carrying out its mission of mercy and truth, righteousness and peace among the sons of men.

Literature.

THE HISTORY OF THE WEST.

GENERAL HISTORY OF WESTERN NATIONS.
By Emil Reich. I. Antiquity. (*Macmillan*.
Two Vols. 15s. net.) Also *ATLAS ANTIQVUS*.
By Emil Reich. (*Macmillan*.)

It is the day of great undertakings in literature. Little books are suffering an eclipse. Among the rest it is the day of great histories. Already more than one history of the whole world has been published, or at least more than one attempt at a history of the whole world. Now comes Dr. Emil Reich with a history, not of the whole world, but of the Western Nations, enough and more than enough for one man to accomplish creditably.

Dr. Reich limits himself. Not in time. In time he deliberately says from 5000 B.C. to 1900

A.D. But in space and character. He limits himself to the Western world and to a broad characterization, not entering into details.

What qualifications has he? Great confidence first of all. Great confidence in his own ability to write this history. And that confidence will carry him a very long way towards the writing of it. He has also style. Though of foreign birth, he writes the English language like a Max Müller. But the qualifications which he himself claims are patient industry, and careful preparation by extensive travelling. Above all else he claims to be a traveller. And he claims that no man can be a historian who has not been a traveller. 'The untravelled historian,' he says, 'is like a chemist who has no laboratory. Travel and sojourn in countries of different types of civilization can alone give those object-

impressions of the forces of history, without which the related *facts* can be neither interpreted nor co-ordinated.'

This leads to the method of his history. It is the comparative method. He is to write the history of the Western nations, and he must take them separately—first the Greeks, next the Romans. But he does not take them separately in the old way. He has Rome in mind when he writes about Greece. And not only Rome, but Scandinavia. And not only the Western nations, but the Eastern nations also. For he is thoroughly convinced that 'the comparative method, which in the study of Myths, Religions, Customs, Languages, or Laws, has proved to be the greatest achievement of the last century, must needs be applied to history too.'

Two volumes are already published. The rest are yet to come.

The Atlas belongs to the History. But not so much as the History belongs to the Atlas. This is one of the things that travel has done for Dr. Reich. It has shown him that history cannot be read without geography. It has furnished him with the maps. For it is not simply that we must follow the march of an army, or the disposition of forces in a battle. The geography often makes the history, and we see this with our own eyes when the Atlas is open before us. Every map, and there are many of them, seems to have been prepared with that same patient industry which the author claims for the writing of his history. And the publishers deserve the greatest credit for their share in the work. Indeed, the publishers deserve much thanks for their enterprise in undertaking the risk of the whole history. But just because they have not grudged enterprise or expense, they are the more likely to be well rewarded.

HERBERT SPENCER.

LIFE AND LETTERS OF HERBERT SPENCER.
By David Duncan, LL.D. With Seventeen
Illustrations. (Methuen, 15s.)

It is well that Herbert Spencer cannot read his own *Life and Letters*. For there never lived a man more sensitive to criticism, and (with the possible exception of Purcell's *Manning*) a franker biography never was written. We are not concerned at present with the ethics of the writing of

biography, or even with its æsthetics. But we cannot help wondering what led the biographer of Herbert Spencer to refer to the rumours which once were current that Spencer had been in love with George Eliot. The rumours were never more than occasionally heard in this country, and it is long since they had passed into the land of forgetfulness. The biographer of George Eliot thought it better not to refer to them, even although he had been urged by Herbert Spencer himself to contradict them. If Spencer had been in love with George Eliot, it might have been necessary for a faithful biographer to say so, in order to describe his life completely. But when he never was in love, when it was only an absurd rumour, neither his life nor his character seemed to demand the recalling of it.

That is an extreme example of the frankness of the book. But all through the book there is an unreserved revelation of Spencer's littlenesses. His touchiness especially is frequently referred to; innumerable letters springing from it are quoted; and whole episodes entirely due to it, such as the quarrels with Professor Huxley and Mr. Frederic Harrison, are described in detail. If we may use the proverb about the difficulty of seeing the wood for the trees, we may say that it is difficult in the biography of Herbert Spencer to see the man for his skin.

The truth is that, with the best will in the world, we cannot possibly say from this biography that Herbert Spencer was a man who deserved to have his biography written. It would be easy to write out a catalogue of weaknesses from its pages. But the only things that were strong in him seem to have been industry and obstinacy. Perhaps we ought to add dislike of the religion of the Churches. But the biographer does not make too much of that. It appears only incidentally, though unmistakably, in the letters.

And yet it is a book of extraordinary interest. If the man had his weaknesses, and was the less a man, this certainly does not detract from the interest which other men feel in him. It is not that we are introduced to so many notable men of the time. The interest always belongs to Spencer himself. For we read the biography as we should read a novel with a hero of doubtful personality, wondering whether he ought to claim our admiration or not. And the wonder keeps up our interest to the end.

Among the Books of the Month.

The series of volumes which goes by the name of 'The World's Epoch-Makers' is not simply another series of short biographies. The volume which has been most recently added is entitled *Cardinal Newman and his Influence on Religious Life and Thought* (T. & T. Clark; 3s.). That title carries out the idea of the series. The men whose biographies are written are men who have done something appreciable to affect the life or thought of the world. And each volume recalls the position of things when its hero arrived on the scene, follows him throughout the work he did, and then shows the difference that his coming made.

Cardinal Newman has been done by Dr. Charles Sarolea, of the University of Edinburgh. It is an estimate of an ecclesiastic by an ecclesiastical outsider. It is an estimate of a man of religion by a philosopher. The surprise of the book, accordingly, is not the worth that is found in Newman as a motive power in the world. For the man would be blind indeed who could miss that. It is the intimate acquaintance which the author possesses with the issues that coloured Newman's life, and the appreciation of the influence even of the smallest of them in forming Newman's character and in shaping subsequent history. Dr. Sarolea could scarcely be a whole-hearted advocate of Newmanism. What is more to the purpose, he is not an advocate of anti-Newmanism. But just because he is outside both parties and sometimes misunderstands both, and yet is so full of knowledge, his book has a distinct and instructive place in the long row of Newman biography.

The Rev. W. L. Walker, in his unassuming retirement, has had a remarkable influence upon the religious thinkers of his generation. But the best of all his books, though published more than three years ago, is almost unknown yet. For it was published in a way that scarcely gave it a chance. Now, however, it has been undertaken by Messrs. T. & T. Clark, and in spite of the commonness of its title, its very unusual merit will soon be discovered.

The title is *The Teaching of Christ* (2s. 6d. net). The full title is *The Teaching of Christ in its Present Appeal*. For its distinctiveness lies in

the way in which Mr. Walker's wonderful gift of expository writing is turned to practical account on behalf of Christian life and doctrine. The teaching of Christ has too often been treated academically. With Mr. Walker also it is a subject of study; but not for the sake of the study. He is not content to understand it; he must see it enter into life. It is evident that he does not believe we can even understand it until we allow it the opportunity of forming Christ within us.

'The history of the world is the biography of great men.' And so the Rev. W. Beveridge, M.A., who recently wrote a *Short History of the Westminster Assembly*, which brought him into touch with several great men, has now made a study of the ecclesiastical leaders in Scotland throughout its history, and has published his volume under the title of *Makers of the Scottish Church* (T. & T. Clark; 2s.). The volume begins with Columba, and ends with Robert Rainy. Mr. Beveridge is one of the very few men in Scotland who make a special study of Church History. And he does make a special study of it. Confining himself to Scotland, he has come to know its ecclesiastical history intimately. We said that his new book begins with Columba. There is a chapter before that on 'The Pioneers of the Scottish Church.' That chapter is enough to show that there is room for another History of Scotland, which should begin at the very beginning, and that Mr. Beveridge is the man to write it.

We have had the official statement of Socialism. We have now the official statement against it. We have had more than one official account of it and they are not all in agreement. The greatest difficulty about Socialism is to know what Socialism is. But there is one statement against Socialism, and there is no doubt about its being both official and authoritative. Its title is *The Case against Socialism* (Allen; 5s. net). It is further described as 'A Handbook for Speakers and Candidates.' It has been prepared by the London Municipal Society, and it has received the imprimatur of the Right Hon. A. J. Balfour, M.P.

In the chapter on 'Socialism and Religion' there are subdivisions. The first subdivision is 'Atheism the Aim of Socialism.' Another is 'Socialism its own Religion,' and another 'Christian Socialism.' And how is the Christian Socialist

handled? He is handled with an array of quotations from the writings of Socialists who are not Christian, in which the idea of a Socialist being a Christian, or a Christian a Socialist, is held up to scorn. Is that all that is said about Christian Socialism? That is all.

The Gifford lecturer before the University of Aberdeen in the year 1907 was Professor Hans Driesch, of Heidelberg. And Professor Driesch set a new example to Gifford lecturers. It is generally understood that Lord Gifford did not want too much religion in the lectures. It is possible that some have contained too much. Professor Driesch's Lectures have none at all. They contain an exposition of analytical biology, and religion is not once in sight. Their title, as published, is *The Science and Philosophy of the Organism* (A. & C. Black; 10s. 6d. net).

How did Aberdeen enjoy the lectures? In the book they are divided up into short chapters and shorter sections. But, after all, for the non-expert in biology they are a little difficult. When the new words, which are numerous, are mastered, sense can be obtained from the sentences. And it is good sense, and no doubt sound biology. The question, however, which cannot be dismissed from the mind is what it has to do with Natural Religion. And then the question arises, Is Natural Religion henceforth to be looked upon as non-existent, and are the Gifford lecturers of the future to deal either with revelation or else with physical science?

The Baird Lecture for 1907 was delivered by the Rev. Thomas Nicol, D.D., Professor of Divinity and Biblical Criticism in the University of Aberdeen. Professor Nicol wisely chose the subject he was working upon, the external evidence for the Gospels. And he showed that he was working upon it to some purpose. The Lectures are now published under the title of *The Four Gospels in the Earliest Church History* (Blackwood; 7s. 6d. net). Professor Nicol has no opportunity for originality; and he has not to win his spurs, like a young German theologian, by being original at the expense of probability. What we have in the volume is a summary of the evidence for the credibility of the Gospels, as that is now available in the articles in the recent Dictionaries of the Bible, and in the writings of Sanday, Zahn, Harnack,

Drummond, Allen, and others. It is true that all we find in the book is to be found in the article on the Gospels by Dr. Newport White in the *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*. But the lecture form and Professor Nicol's skill in popular exposition will bring the evidence home to minds which are not reached by Dictionary articles. And there is nothing of any external kind that is more vital in the interests of the propagation of the gospel in these days than a true apprehension of the external evidence for the credibility of the Gospels.

If students of Church History have not been plentiful in Scotland for some time, even the few have had difficulty in finding their subject. There is at present even something like a determination to forget the past, as if in that way the efforts towards Church union might more easily be successful. We shall return to the history of the Church in Scotland, and then the great historian of its history will come. Meantime men like the Rev. George Christie, B.D., keep alive such interest as we have. And he has been most successful in avoiding controversy. For the subject of his book is *The Influence of Letters on the Scottish Reformation* (Blackwood; 6s. net). Mr. Christie has written that he may be read. He has written pleasantly and quotes freely. But every page of the book contains evidence of patient search and verification. It ends with a glossary and an Index of Writers and Writings.

The Vicar of St. Jude's, Hull, does not think that his sermons deserve the honours of print. He prints them in deference to the opinion of those who heard them preached. And for once we agree with those who heard them preached. These sermons seem to retain on the printed page the directness and simplicity of their delivery; and eloquence is not essential to a great sermon. The title of the first sermon is given to the book, *Some Moral Proofs of the Resurrection* (Brown; 2s. 6d. net).

Mr. Edward Grubb, M.A., has written a book on *Authority and the Light Within* (Clarke; 2s. net). He begins by asking where authority is to be found—in a Church, in a Book, in Human Reason, or in a Spiritual Intuition? In a Spiritual Intuition, he says. For Mr. Grubb is a Quaker. But he

has written his book, not to prove to those who are not Quakers that authority is found in intuition, though he may do that as he goes, and it will make him happy. He has written to prove to his fellow Quakers that the way in which they express their doctrine of a spiritual intuition is antiquated and incredible. What is the matter with it? First, it has no answer to the charge that it makes the individual infallible; and next, it has no answer to the charge that, being wholly supernatural and non-human, it involves the depreciation of human faculties. The fundamental error of the early Quakers was to refer the Light Within to a separable faculty instead of letting it act upon our personality as a whole. If properly guarded in its expression, Mr. Grubb has no doubt whatever that the doctrine of the Light Within is the only refuge for a troubled conscience.

The Rev. J. F. Bethune-Baker, B.D., the author of our best general History of Early Christian Doctrine, has given himself to the special study of one great early heresy and heretic, and through the Cambridge Press has published *Nestorius and his Teaching* (4s. 6d. net). Mr. Bethune-Baker believes that such a study is likely to be more profitable in our day than ever before. For, he says, 'we are able to-day to read the past history of the Church with less prejudice than was possible in former times. We can see that the "heretic" and the "schismatic" often had scant justice done them, and that free enough play for differences of temperament and individual and racial environment was not allowed in the Church.' But Mr. Bethune-Baker is not the man to follow the fashion of making heresy orthodoxy, and orthodoxy heresy. He has studied the whole of the evidence for and against the heresy of Nestorius, and the result is that some of our traditional inheritances are disputed, and some of them disproved. But he has never allowed himself to become an advocate for Nestorianism, or even for Nestorius.

Commercially-minded men and boys are putting the question, 'What should I learn Latin for?' Give them this answer—'That you may be able to read the Confessions of Augustine in the original.' For a translation of the Confessions of Augustine is not the same. Principal Dods tells us that felicity in phraseology is one of Augustine's three great gifts; and no man is able to turn his felic-

ious phrases into English, preserving their felicity. Therefore those who know Latin will read Augustine in the original. And those who do not may be advised to learn it for that end.

A critical edition of *The Confessions of Augustine* has been published at the Cambridge University Press (7s. 6d. net). It is edited by Professor John Gibb, of Westminster College, and the Rev. W. Montgomery, B.D. It belongs to the series of 'Cambridge Patristic Texts.' And that enables us to understand that it has an Introduction, a Table of Dates, a History of the Text, Explanatory Footnotes, and three most valuable Indexes—an Index of Subjects, an Index of Texts, and an Index of Latin Words. The editors curiously apologize for the notes. They fear that readers may think them intrusive. In certain passages they themselves believe that they would be intrusive, and so 'the present editors have endeavoured to maintain silence on those occasions when it seemed more fitting than speech.'

Three Teachers of Alexandria, by the Rev. L. B. Radford, M.A. (Cambridge Press; 2s. 6d. net), is a study in the early history of Origenism and Anti-Origenism. The three teachers are Theognostus, Pierius, and Peter the Martyr.

The new volumes of Dr. Maclaren's *Expositions of Holy Scripture* (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net each) contain his sermons on the texts of the Book of Psalms. Dr. Maclaren has preached the contents of two handsome volumes on the Book of Psalms. But there are Psalms in which he has never found a text. This leads one to wonder if he selects his texts on any principle, and if so, what that principle is. Some men made the discovery of their lives when they discovered that without sacrificing variety, which is so necessary to the interest of the sermon, they could lead their people systematically through the Bible, and make it known to them as a book of systematic though developed doctrine.

Private Prayers and Devotions, by the Rev. J. E. Roberts, M.A., B.D., Manchester (Thomas Law; 2s. 6d. net), is not a collection of prayers simply, although there are some fine and some famous prayers in it. It is a guide to the devotional life. There is no prayer that we have greater need for uttering than the prayer, 'Lord, teach us to pray.'

The man who reads this book prayerfully will be taught to pray.

Take note of *The Free Church Year Book for 1908* (Thomas Law; 2s. 6d. net). It includes the Official Report of the Thirteenth National Council of the Evangelical Free Churches.

The editors of the Oxford Library of Practical Theology have induced the Bishop of Gloucester to write a volume on *The Three Creeds* (Longmans; 5s.). It is a most suitable subject for a volume, and Dr. Gibson was the very man to write it. His book on the Thirty-nine Articles gave him this right and appropriateness. The temptation to a writer upon such a subject is always to overbalance the book with footnotes. Dr. Gibson has only an occasional reference to literature. For he has written, not to uphold his own opinion of disputed points, but to furnish the ordinary reader with a fair account of the history and character of the three Creeds of Christianity.

The new volume of the Eversley edition of Tennyson is entitled *Ballads and Other Poems* (Macmillan; 4s. net). It contains an Appendix which gives a translation of the Sixth Book of the *Iliad* in rhythmical prose. The translation was made by Tennyson at the suggestion of his father, and revised by Professor Lushington.

Messrs. Macmillan have published another volume of Mr. Frederic Harrison's Collected Essays. In the first volume, entitled *The Creed of a Layman*, Mr. Harrison traced the growth of his own convictions 'from a Theologic to a Scientific Faith.' In the second volume, *The Philosophy of Common Sense*, he dealt with 'the intellectual grounds on which a human religion must be based.' The present volume is the natural complement of these treatises. Its object is to show Mr. Harrison's system of philosophic religion in action. Its title is *National and Social Problems* (7s. 6d. net).

'Let us observe,' says Mr. Harrison, 'the practical effect of religion—of philosophic religion—in moulding opinion on the great questions of Nations and of Society: on patriotism, international justice, government; and again on problems of Wealth, of Labour, of Socialism.' Why *philosophic* religion? Because 'theology,

absorbed in matters of Worship and hopes of Heaven, has no call to meddle with earthly politics, to offer counsel to secular rulers, or to propound any scheme for reorganizing society. Its kingdom is not of this world.' So says Mr. Harrison. And, in saying so, he reveals that fundamental misunderstanding of Christianity which runs through all his writings. It is not to be denied that theologians have been guilty of the same misunderstanding. But not recently. Mr. Harrison writes to-day in the introduction to his new volume what he might have written with some point five-and-twenty years ago. The theologian has learned something from the positivist. Let the positivist learn that modern 'theologic' Christianity includes an application of the Sermon on the Mount.

The contents of the volume are National Problems and Social Problems. The national problems begin with 'Bismarckism, or the Policy of Blood and Iron,' and end with 'Empire and Humanity.' The social problems deal with the limits of Political Economy, Trades-Unionism, Industrial Co-operation, Social Remedies, Socialist Unionism, and Moral and Religious Socialism.

In Principal Garvie's Westminster New Testament, *The Gospel according to St. Matthew* has been done by the Rev. David Smith, D.D. (Melrose; 2s. net). Dr. Smith's manner is well known now and much appreciated. But he has, of course, very little room here for originality. We are glad to notice an improvement on the outward appearance of this volume; it is now all that can be desired.

It is still the humanness of our Lord that we most emphasize. Not His humanity. Not a theological something that we oppose to His Divinity. It is His humanness that is emphasized by the Rev. W. W. Sidey in that Study of the Life of Jesus and His Twelve Disciples which he calls *The First Christian Fellowship* (Melrose; 2s. net). 'This do in remembrance of me,' said Jesus, and Mr. Sidey recalls the pathetic words of Keats, 'I think I shall be among the immortals when I die.' He refers also to the aged mother, plying her needle and thread that her children may remember her.

Another volume has been added to the West-

minster Commentaries edited by Professor Lock, and it is one of the volumes we are most in need of. It is Mr. McNeile's commentary on *The Book of Exodus* (Methuen; 10s. 6d.).

In the end of his Preface Mr. McNeile says: 'Since Exodus follows Genesis, this volume is destined to stand next on the shelf to Professor Driver's work; so near—and yet so far from the strong balance of judgment and wide learning which have always been to me both curb and spur.' This attitude and this accomplishment are characteristic. As readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, we are not ignorant of Mr. McNeile's work. We know that his interest is not in the minutiae of distant scholarship, but in making the Old Testament of practical use in the ministrations of the Church and the daily life of the Christian. But we also know that no desire for immediate edification tempts him to build otherwise than on a foundation of exact modern scholarship.

The Introduction contains eight sections, and ends with a list of passages of Scripture illustrated in it. These sections are: (1) The Component Parts of the Book of Exodus; (2) Analysis; (3) The Laws in Exodus; (4) The Priesthood; (5) The Tabernacle (with Illustrations); (6) The Geography of Exodus (with Map); (7) The Historical Value of the Book of Exodus; (8) The Religious Value of the Book of Exodus. The eighth is a new section in commentaries, but in that also Driver has led the way. In the section on the Tabernacle this note occurs: 'Many attempts have been made to elucidate the details specified in xxvi., xxvii. 9–18, and to produce from them a coherent description; and it would be of little use to enter into a prolonged discussion of their various merits. The commentaries of Dillmann, Baentsch, and Holzinger; the archæologies of Keil and Nowack; the dictionary articles of Riehm, Riegenbach, and Benzinger; and the monographs by Bähr, Popper, Brown, and Caldecott, present a bewildering abundance of conflicting opinions. The work, however, which appears to the present writer to leave the fewest problems unsolved is Kennedy's article TABERNACLE in *D.B.* iv. He strikes out, on some points, an independent and successful line of his own, which he will doubtless present more fully in his forthcoming commentary.'

Besides the commentary, which we cannot illustrate in a review, there are some detached

notes. One of them is on the name Jahweh. To know what is in the name Jahweh is to know the Old Testament. But we have referred to this note on another page.

Messrs. Mowbray have published a selection of sermons preached by the late Bishop Wilkinson of St. Andrews. The title is *The Invisible Glory* (5s. net). The Bishop of London has written a Preface to the volume. How difficult it is to describe a man in a few sentences. How difficult to convey to others the impression which the personality of a man makes upon us. How difficult when the impression is simply the impression of goodness. Yet the Bishop of London, in a Preface of four and a half pages, succeeds. He contradicts himself. He contradicts himself more than once. But that does not hinder his success; that makes him successful. He mentions Bishop Wilkinson's faith. 'If ever there was a man,' he says, 'who had his head above the mists it was the Bishop of S. Andrews.' And then on the next page, 'I remember well one day when I was walking with him in Scotland, I said to him, "I often think of your lesson of *the law of day by day as one of the laws of the kingdom.*" He looked quickly at me and said, "Did I say that?" "Why, of course you did," I said in surprise, "there is a whole chapter on it in the book entitled *The Laws of the Kingdom.*" He said nothing more at the time, but next day he said to me, "It was curious your saying yesterday about the law of day by day. I *wanted* it said to me yesterday, I was worrying dreadfully about something."

The sermons belong to the personality. There is no doubt that they lose enormously in the loss of the living voice. But it is not impossible for the reader, after studying the personality of Bishop Wilkinson if he did not know him, to think himself back into it as he reads the sermons, and hear the voice that said, 'I beseech you, even with tears.' What were the things that came first with such a man? In an address to Church Workers he sums up the teaching of thirteen years at St. Peter's, Eaton Square. There are thirteen heads of it, one for each of the years, as he quaintly and characteristically puts it. The first is the completeness of redemption, next the headship of Christ over the Church, then the Prayer-Book as guide, with the Ordinary as its interpretation;

after that, regeneration through baptism, to be followed by conversion. We are regenerated, he says, in order that we may be converted. But the whole list is given in a short paragraph at the end. 'Redemption; the Church; the Prayer-Book our guide; Regeneration; Conversion; Progress; the Personality of the Holy Ghost; the Value of the Bible; of the two Sacraments; of Prayer; Worship; Paradise and the Advent.'

On future retribution the controversialists are at present quiet, but there is nothing that more sorely agitates the conscience of the Christian. And the book on *The Doctrine of the Last Things*, which has been written by the Rev. J. G. Greenhough, M.A., and published by the National Free Church Council (2s. 6d. net), will be welcomed in all the Churches. It will be welcomed neither for its orthodoxy nor for its heterodoxy—these being, on this subject, extremes and much discredited—but for its reticence. It is the reticence of the Bible and of Christ. On the things we do know, such as the fact of future retribution, Mr. Greenhough is emphatic enough. But on the things which we do not know (and there is more concealed than all that has been revealed), he makes no pretence of knowledge.

The Full Blessing of Pentecost, by the Rev. Andrew Murray, D.D. (Nisbet; 2s. 6d.), is a volume of sermons. And the sermons are so arranged that we gradually learn what the full blessing of Pentecost is, gradually come to desire it, and at last obtain it if we will. It is the clearest exposition that Dr. Murray has yet given us of the great doctrine which his whole life has been spent in commending.

We have innumerable studies of 'The Imitation of Christ,' but there is room for another study of à Kempis himself. The Rev. D. Butler, D.D., of Galashiels, has prepared it. His title is *Thomas à Kempis: A Religious Study* (Oliphant; 2s. 6d. net). The fascination of the *De Imitatione* is too strong upon Dr. Butler to allow him to deal exclusively with the author of it. And as he writes for a popular audience there is no harm in that. But the discoveries which he has made are about Thomas himself. And for these discoveries, especially for the discovery of his author's relation-

ship to the reformed faith, his book will be read by the educated.

Professor John Adams and Sir Joshua Fitch are the great exponents of the art of teaching in our time. A cheap edition of Sir Joshua Fitch's *The Art of Teaching* (1s. net) has been published by the Sunday School Union.

Mr. Allen Upward has told the story of certain famous *Secrets of the Past* (Owen; 6s.). The title promises some sensation, and the promise is repeated in the titles of the chapters—'A Secret of the Tower,' 'The Tragedy of Kirk-a-Field,' 'The Galley of Nero,' and the like. But Mr. Upward scarcely rises to his opportunity. How Mr. Andrew Lang would have revelled in it and made our blood curdle.

We shall soon have a complete History of the Church written from the Anglican point of view, and in volumes convenient to handle. Published by Messrs. Rivington, its title is 'The Church Universal.' The latest issue is *The Age of Revolution, 1648-1815* (4s. 6d. net). The author is the Rev. W. H. Hutton, B.D. Mr. Hutton is also the general editor of the series. The period is a long one for so small a book, but Mr. Hutton has the gift, not of condensing, which is not required, but of selecting the essential events, and vividly characterizing them.

An Apostle of the North is the title which has been given to the Memoirs of the Right Rev. William Carpenter Bompas, D.D., First Bishop of Athabasca, First Bishop of Mackenzie River, First Bishop of Selkirk (Seeley; 7s. 6d. net). The biography has been prepared by the Rev. H. A. Cody, B.A., of Whitehorse, Y.T., with the assistance of Mrs. Bompas, Judge Bompas, and others, and the book has been commended by the Most Rev. S. P. Matheson, D.D., Archbishop of Rupert's Land.

It is a biography which has many subsidiary matters of interest. There is adventure enough to satisfy the appetite of a public school boy. There is much reliable information for the student of religion, and there is even much direct light thrown upon the interpretation of the Old Testament. For we know that Bishop Bompas was early struck with the parallels between the customs of the Crees and other Indian tribes and

the customs of the Tribes of Israel, and even published a book about it, some portions of which are reproduced here. But the value of the biography lies, as it ought to lie, in the exposition of the man's character. And to know such a man, as this book enables us to know him, is to add to the arguments in favour of the ultimate universality of the Gospel. For the character of Bishop Bompas could not have been the product of any other religion than Christianity, and it is the only character that one would entrust the dominion of the earth to.

Under the editorship of Professor Edward Arber, Mr. Elliot Stock has undertaken the issue of 'A Christian Library.' The first volume is *A Brief Discourse of the Troubles at Frankfort 1554 to 1558, Attributed to Whittingham* (5s. net). Why does Professor Arber begin with 'A Brief Discourse'? Because his purpose in the whole series is to 'implant and cherish in the hearts of all his readers a perfect detestation and execration of Compulsion in Religion and of Persecution for Religious Opinions.' He contributes an Introduction to the book. He also reprints the Life of Whittingham, written by a Student of the Temple about 1603, and he works through the whole of the Brief Discourse, adding notes in brackets.

Mr. Stock has also published *Short and Simple Family Prayers, with Bible Readings*, by an Englishwoman (2s. 6d. net).

The Rev. Samuel M. Zwemer is a missionary to

Muslims. And more than that, he is a missionary to other Muslim missionaries. He does his work as a missionary, and report says he does it well; and he writes books that others may know what Muhammadanism is. The title of his latest book is *Islam: A Challenge to Faith*. It is published at the Office of the Student Volunteer Movement in New York, and it is on sale in England at the Office of the Student Christian Movement, 95 Chancery Lane, W.C. The chief value of the book, for missionaries as for all others, lies in the fair and well-informed account it gives, first of the faith of Islam, and then of its ethics. Concentrate attention on its ethics. All men are directing their attention to ethics now. By its ethics Islam will stand or fall. And Islam can never rid itself of its ethics, or even greatly improve them.

Messrs. Watts have published a very cheap edition of Mr. P. Vivian's book *The Churches and Modern Thought*. What are the arguments that are now most relied upon by the open opponent of Christianity? They are, in Mr. Vivian's phraseology, 'the grave suspicions aroused by the study of ancient beliefs,' and 'irreconcilable difficulties connected with evolution.' The difficulties connected with evolution are apparently summed up in the phrase 'nature red in tooth and claw.' But that phrase has been discredited of late. The suspicions aroused by the study of ancient beliefs are another matter. But something depends upon their student.

The Archaeology of the Book of Genesis.

BY PROFESSOR THE REV. A. H. SAYCE, D.D., LITT.D., OXFORD.

The Garden of Eden (Gn 2⁸⁻¹⁴).

8. Eden.—Edina or Edin, 'the plain,' was the Sumerian name of the cultivated part of Babylonia; the Semites borrowed the word under the form of *edinu*. 𒂗 is the Babylonian *ganû*, which also appears as *ginu* and *gannatu*, and is explained as meaning 'a planted field' (*meristum*, C.T. xii. 17. 37). *Ganû* itself is borrowed from the Sumerian *gan*. Babylonia was the original home of the enclosed garden or plantation; the early legal

documents are full of references to it, and it is represented by one of the primitive hieroglyphics which developed into the cuneiform characters.

The Heb. מִקְדֶּם, *mikkēdem*, may represent the Babylonian *qudmis*, 'at the beginning,' but it more probably describes the position of 'the garden' as on the eastern side of the Babylonian plain. 'The man,' it will be noted, had already been formed before he was placed in the garden; indeed,

the *waw consecutivum* at the beginning of the verse implies that the garden was made subsequently to his creation. See v. 15.

9. The Tree of Life.—The Babylonian 'garden' was primarily a plantation of trees; vegetables were grown in the open fields. The 'tree of life' belongs to the first beginnings of Babylonian art, whence it made its way to Elam on the east, and to Palestine and Asia Minor on the west. In Assyria it assumed a curiously conventionalized form with knots and leaves, a winged genius being frequently represented on either side of it with a cone-like object in his hand. Whether the Babylonian tree of life was originally the vine or the palm is still doubtful: the Sumerian *gis ges-tin*, 'the tree of the drink of life,' usually signified 'the vine,' *ges-tin* being 'grape wine,' but it may have primarily denoted 'palm wine.' The Babylonians believed eating certain food would secure for them immortality and youth; Adamu, the first man, lost the gift of immortality by refusing to taste 'the food of life' (*akal baladhi*) and 'the water of life' (*mê baladhi*) when they were offered him by the supreme god Anu, and a snake stole away 'the plant' gathered by Gilgames, which 'made the old man young again.'

The tree of knowledge was called *kiskanû* by the Babylonians, from the Sumerian *gis-kin*, 'the tree of the oracle.' The fragment of a legend preserved in an exorcism tells us how it grew in Eridu, 'the good city':

In Eridu the dark *kiskanû* grew, created in the holy place,
its appearance was as brilliant *lapis lazuli*, planted beside
the Deep,

which is the path of Ea, filling Eridu with fertility.
Its¹ seat is the centre of the land,
its habitation the couch of the (primeval) goddess Nammu.
To the holy house like a forest does its shadow stretch
into the midst whereof no man entereth.
Within it are the Sun-god and Tammuz;
between the mouths of the rivers which are on either side
have the gods Ka-khegal and Si-tur-gal planted this *gis-kin*
tree.

The *gis-kin* (with a slightly different spelling) is mentioned in several early Babylonian inscriptions. Eri-Aku or Arioch states that he had 'fulfilled the oracle of the *gis-kin* of Eridu,' Bur-Sin that he had 'restored to its place the *gis-kin* of Eridu,' and Sin-idinnam of Larsa that he had 'restored the oracle of the *gis-kin* of the Anunnaki,' or 'spirits of Earth.' One of the Semitic equivalents

¹ Not 'his,' i.e. Ea's, as has been suggested.

of *kin* was *tirtu*, the Heb. *thôrâh* (*W.A.I.* ii. 29. 44).²

The oracle tree seems to have been the cedar, since the exorcism in which the fragment relating to it has been embedded orders recourse to be had to 'the cedar tree, which destroys the power of the incubus and on whose core the name of Ea is inscribed,' in order to deliver a man who had been possessed by 'seven evil spirits.' Dr. Pinches (*The Old Testament*, p. 77) quotes a text in which we read: 'To the place of Ea, Samas, Merodach, and the Lady of Eden, which is the hidden place(?) of heaven and earth, the band of companions must not approach in order to decide the oracle; the message of the oracle they shall not reveal; their hands (must not touch?) the cedar tree beloved of the great gods.'

The 'good and evil' of which the oracle tree originally gave knowledge would have been good and evil fortune. A moral sense came afterwards to be attached to the words, and the Hebrew writer knows no other.

In the Babylonian poem translated above the tree is described as being in 'the eye' or 'centre of the earth.' In Gn 3³ the tree of knowledge is similarly described as 'in the middle of the garden.' Here, however, it is the tree of life that is 'in the middle of the garden,' the mention of the other tree being somewhat awkwardly appended to it as if it were an afterthought. But if we turn the verse back into Assyrian, we find that the Hebrew בֵּתְחֹק, *bêthôk*, is merely a literal rendering of the Assyrian *ina libbi*, which really signifies simply 'within.' The original text would have been *ina libbi-sa GIS GESTIN û kiskanû*, 'within it were the tree of life and the tree of knowledge'; cp. line 8 of the Babylonian poem.

² In a good many instances what has been supposed to be a representation of the tree of life on the Assyro-Babylonian monuments is really a representation of the tree of knowledge. Thus, on a seal-cylinder figured in Layard's *Nineveh and Babylon* (p. 292), Ea, the god of wisdom, clad in the fish-skin of Oannes, stands beside the tree, while the winged solar disc is above it; and on a monument discovered by M. de Morgan at Susa, the tree is grasped by the hands of a human-headed fish. On a monument from Northern Syria, now in the Louvre, the tree is associated with a serpent, as it is on the famous seal-cylinder, first noticed by George Smith, which has been supposed to be a Babylonian representation of the Fall. At Taanach Dr. Sellin found an altar, on one side of which is the sacred tree, and on another a youth strangling a serpent (*Tell Ta'annek*, pp. 76, 77).

10. The River that 'flowed out of Eden' was the *Nâr Marratî*, or 'Salt River,' which, after passing through the marshes formed by the silt, became the Persian Gulf. In early times the Tigris and Euphrates, as well as the Kerkhah and Karûn, entered the 'Salt River' by different mouths. The 'Salt River' was itself a part of the ocean which surrounded the world, and into which the Tigris and Euphrates were supposed to flow in the distant north. Hence the mouths by which they entered the Gulf could also be described as 'heads,' the 'Salt River' with its flowing tide being regarded as the source of them.¹ The original mouths of the Tigris and Euphrates were a little to the east of the site of Eridu; in the Babylonian poem, therefore, the tree of knowledge is stated to have been planted between them. A *nâr Edinna*, or 'River of Eden,' is mentioned by Gudea and Khammu-rabi; but it was probably a canal in the neighbourhood of Tello.

The Assyrian form of the latter part of the verse may have been *ipparis-ma ana irbit rêsi saknu*.

11. Pison is the Ass. *pisannu*, 'an artificial water-course,' and more specifically 'a shadûf.' Since Havilah was the northern desert of Arabia to the west of Babylonia, the river would seem to have been the Pallacopas canal, the Palukkâtu of the inscriptions, corresponding with the Nahr Hindiya, Shatt el-Khusif, and Shatt Atshân of to-day. I have shown in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, xviii. p. 234, that the part of Arabia immediately adjoining Babylonia was known as Tilmun in the early Babylonian epoch. The Hebrew Havilah, however, also included the western portion of the district, which extended to the frontier of Egypt and was called Melukhkha ('the Salt Desert') by the Babylonians.

12. It was from Melukhkha that Gudea imported gold. Meissner has pointed out that בְּדֹלָה, *bēdōlah*,

¹ The nature of the Babylonian conception will be understood by a reference to the early Babylonian map which I have published in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, xviii. p. 69, where the 'bird's beak' or inlet of the sea represents that part of the 'Salt River' which went out of Eden to water the garden. It is placed 'eastward in Eden,' and close to its head is a point which indicates the centre or *omphalos* of the world, and may correspond with the position assigned to the 'Garden.'

'bdellium,' is the Babylonian *budulku* (C.T. xiv. 33. 10), which is probably the resin of a tree. The *shohem* stone is the *sāmtu*, or 'blue-stone,' of the Babylonians, from *sīamu*, 'blue,' which is described as the characteristic product of Melukhkha, and is perhaps the turquoise of Sinai.

13. I have explained the name of the Gihon (which has been assimilated to the Hebrew גִּיחֹן) in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, xvii. pp. 470-471. Šakhan, which is given as a synonym of the Euphrates (W.A.I. *ii. 35-36), should be read Gi-khan according to 93042, Bb. 28, *gikhan* being a Sumerian word for 'fishing-net,' which was borrowed by Semitic Babylonian in the form of *gikhinnu*.

Kush should be Kash, as in Gn 10⁸, i.e. the land of the Kassites. Whether this means their original home in Elam, or that portion of Babylonia which took its name from them after their conquest of the country, is doubtful.

14. Hiddekhel is the Sumerian Idigla, a dialectal form of Idigna, which in later Semitic Babylonian became Idiglat, with ה for the initial vowel, as in הֵיכָל, *hēkhâl*, for *ekallu*, 'palace.' The Hebrew form, it will be noticed, has been taken from the Sumerian, which perhaps implies that the name was written ideographically in the cuneiform text which the Hebrew writer had before him.

Ashshur must be here the city of Assur (now Qalāt Sherghât), not Assyria, since the Tigris is described as being on its east side. Hence the geography takes us back to a time before the rise of Nineveh. As it is necessary to define the course of the Tigris, it is further plain that the writer to whom the geographical description is due wrote for those who lived in Western Babylonia and were familiar with the Euphrates, but not with the Tigris; in other words, that they were natives of Ur or Babylon or of some other city which was situated on the Euphrates.

The geographical paragraph (vv. 11-14) reads like an extract from one of the numerous Babylonian geographical tablets, the phraseology being similar, and some of the tablets relating to the rivers of Babylonia. In Babylonia, it must be remembered, the word *nāru* (נָדָר) signifies both 'river' and 'canal.'

Contributions and Comments.

Four Biblical Names.

THE comparison of אבה with אה and of אבי with או suggests that ב may sometimes be weakened to ו, and then become absorbed. Accordingly, we may explain איזבל 'Jezebel' as meaning *Father of Honour* (?); a 'hypocoristic' abridgment of the Phœnician בעלאזבל 'Baal-'Izèbel,' *Baal is the Father of Honour* (?), *Cis. i. 158*. The process of contraction may be supposed to have been אִי = אִי = אִי. Similarly, another woman's name, Abi-gail, Abi-gêl, may be (*Baal is*) *the Father of Mirth*; cf. Bealiah, *Baal is Jah*, and Beiliada, *Baal knows* (1 Ch 12⁵ 14⁷), a son of David, as Abigail was his wife. A more difficult name is איוב 'Iyyôb or 'Job.' The author of the book may have chosen it from the great storehouse of ancient legend, because it seemed to signify *Father of Outcry* or *Lamentation*, as though it were derived from יוב+אבי (יב+א Pi. cry shrilly; NH lament). It thus seemed to express the most obvious characteristic of his hero—complaint or protest against the apparent injustice of Heaven. The real second element, however, may be אוב, *to speak in a deep hollow voice, like a ghost*; cf. Job 4¹⁶. This old legendary name would then mean *Father of Divination* (by Necromancy: 1 S 28⁷). The form is easily explicable as follows: 'Abiy-ôb becomes 'Abiyyôb by Regressive Assimilation; and this, by contraction of the first element, 'Iyyôb. (It is, of course, tempting to compare names of the First Dynasty, like *Ayabu-waqar* and *Achchu-ayabi*, as Dr. Ranke has already done; but can *ayabu* in these names mean 'enemy,' as he supposes?)

An old Babylonian tablet in the library of St. John's College, Oxford, sets at rest the question of the origin of the curious name Achiacharus (To 1²¹ etc.). Here we find among the witnesses to a deed of sale, executed in the reign of Apil-Sin, the fourth king of the First Dynasty (circ. 2100 B.C.), a certain *Achu-waqar* (A-chu-waqar), the *kamarum* (perhaps *priest*; cf. Heb. כמרים, Zeph 1⁴). This confirms the אחיקר of the Heb. and Aram. versions of Tobit, and proves that the name is not Persian, but pure Semitic. Other tablets in the same collection give us *Abum-waqar* and *Ili-waqar*.

C. J. BALL.

Notes on Isaiah.

Is 28¹⁶, לֹא יַחֲזִישׁ, *shall not make haste*, A.V. and R.V. This seems a meaningless description of the stone which Yahveh laid in Zion, 'a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner-stone, a sure foundation: he that believeth shall not make haste.' Read יַחֲזִישׁ לֵי, *shall hasten to it* (i.e. the sure foundation), or *trust in it*, and the passage becomes luminous. For interchange of לֹא and לֵי, cf. Is 9⁸ and elsewhere. The Hiphil of חָזַשׁ, which is used of excitement or fear in Job 20² and Ec 2²⁵, is used of making haste *to*, not *away*, in Ps 71¹². חָזַשׁ לְעֹזְרִי, *hasten to my help*, and also in Ps 55⁹. For a similar sentiment, cf. Is 14³². וְכִבֵּה, Yahveh hath founded Zion, and the poor of His people *shall trust in it*, or *shall betake themselves to it* (margin, A.V.), or *shall take refuge in her* (R.V.). The two last renderings throw a light on the meaning of the passage under discussion, and give us a picture of the 'great rock in a weary land' (Ps 32²), 'the rock of thy strength' (Is 17¹⁰), and the rock on which the wise man builds his house (Mt 7²⁴).

Is 52¹³, הִנֵּה יִשְׁכִּיל עַבְדִּי, *Behold, my servant shall deal wisely* (R.V.), *deal prudently* (A.V.), *prosper* (margin of A.V. and R.V.). The prophet, however, seems to refer to the understanding of the Servant, who 'by his knowledge (בִּדְעוּתָהּ) shall justify many' (53¹¹), rather than to any prudent or wise dealing. The LXX correctly gives in the first passage συνήσει (Vulg. *intelliget*), and in the second συνέσει. The newly discovered Apostolic Preaching of Irenæus has the passive here, the German having *wird anerkannt*. The rendering, 'Behold, my servant shall understand,' i.e. these things, would also bring the passage more into line with such passages as Mt 11²⁷, 'All things have been delivered unto me of my Father: and no man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him.' It would also show a similar connexion between the knowledge and self-sacrifice of the Servant as that described in Jn 10¹⁵, 'As the Father knoweth me, even so know I the Father: and I lay down my life for the sheep.' The exaltation described in the following

words, 'He shall be exalted and extolled and be very high' (52¹³), would therefore mark the spiritual ascendancy of a teacher, a מְשִׁבִּיל (both priest and instructor), which was possessed in an eminent degree by the Son of Man, who 'used to teach as one with authority (ἐξουσίαν), and not as the scribes,' and who if He be lifted up (נָשָׂא, Is 52¹³ = ὑψωθῶ, Jn 12³²) will draw all men unto Himself. For the thought, cf. Is 40¹⁴.

Is 53⁵, *The chastisement of our peace was upon Him*. מוֹסֵר originally meant 'belt' (Job 12¹⁸, *He looseth the belt of kings*), or 'bond' from יָסַר. The secondary sense is of chastisement. But it is questionable if this is the significance here. Why should we not render 'the bond of our peace was upon him,' comparing ἔδησαν αὐτὸν of Jn 18¹²?

Is 53⁷, נָשָׂא נְהוּא נַעֲנָה, *He was oppressed, yet he humbled himself* (R.V.). We have nothing new to add on this passage except to notice the manifest superiority of the R.V. to the A.V. rendering, 'He was oppressed, and he was afflicted.' The New Testament teaches that the suffering and humiliation of our Lord were purely voluntary, self-chosen, and self-determined. Regarding this very thing, St. Paul (Ph 2⁷) wrote εἰαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν—ἐταπείνωσεν εἰαυτόν. It would have been well if the Translators of the A.V. had adhered to the reflexive meaning of נַעֲנָה (Niph. of עָנָה), which they correctly rendered in Ex 10³, 'How long wilt thou refuse to humble thyself' (לַעֲנֶה)—a passage which proves the free agency of Pharaoh. The Revisers bring this description of the Servant of Yahveh into line with the Gospels of St. John and St. Paul by keeping before us the voluntary nature of the trials, the perfect autonomy of the Sufferer, and the gentle submissiveness with which He suffered.

Is 53¹¹, מְעַל נַפְשׁוֹ יִרְאֶה יְשֻׁבֵּעַ, *He shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied* (R.V. and A.V.); or, *He shall see and be satisfied with the travail of his soul* (margin of R.V.). Why could not this passage be rendered, 'Free from the suffering of his soul, he shall see and shall be satisfied'? What is it the Servant shall see? Is it His own agony? That was something to be felt rather than seen. Moreover, the word עָמַל, which originally meant 'labour,' had acquired the significance of sorrow, and was used

in Is¹⁰ 10¹ with a distinctly sinister meaning, and could hardly have given satisfaction to the Righteous Servant of Yahveh. Cf. also Jn 16¹¹. מְעַל seems rather to be interpreted after מוֹשְׁרִי (Job 19²⁰), 'without my flesh,' and other examples of מִן in sense of 'free from,' and to mean 'Delivered from the sorrow of his soul, he shall see . . . and shall be satisfied.' The object of his vision is most probably 'his seed.' Vide v.¹⁰, 'He shall see his seed.' The birth of a vast spiritual progeny is the issue of the travail; a great harvest is the outcome of the sowing of the seed-corn. This sight gives satisfaction. יְשֻׁבֵּעַ (of fulness) is often used in connexion with eyes and sight; cf. Pr 27²⁰, 'Sheol and destruction are not; so the eyes of man are never satisfied'; and Ec 1⁸, the eye is not satisfied with seeing. The meaning of the writer would therefore be something like this, 'Free from the suffering of his soul, he shall see his seed, and his eye shall be satisfied.'

F. R. MONTGOMERY HITCHCOCK.

Job the Fifth, and Moses the Seventh, from Abraham.

THE Septuagint has at the end of the Book of Job a genealogical notice, to show that Job was identical with Jobab (Gn 36^{13, 38}); that his father was Zerah (Ζάρε), who was a son of the sons of Esau (ἐκ τῶν Ἰσραὺ υἱὸν υἱός), so that he was *the fifth from Abraham* (ὥστε εἶναι αὐτὸν πέμπτον ἀπὸ Ἀβραάμ).

This genealogical relation of Job to Abraham was generally accepted in the Early Church; it is most decidedly insisted upon by Eusebius in his *Demonstratio Evangelica*, who ranks Job (with Enoch, Noah, Melchisedek, Abraham) among those, who before Moses and Christ were Christians, as being neither Jews nor Heathen. Eusebius says: Job did not keep the Sabbath nor any other Jewish institution; why not? he was older than Moses and his legislation: 'for Moses was the seventh from Abraham, but he the fifth, therefore two generations earlier than Moses' (ὁ μὲν γὰρ Μωσῆς ἑβδόμος ἐξ Ἀβραάμ γενεαλογεῖται, οὗτος δὲ πέμπτος, δυοὶ προτέραις τὸν Μωσέα γενεαὶς προάγων, i. 6. 13). Here a little mistake seems to have occurred, caused by the difference of counting, still in use in

genealogy (Roman system). For the relations are these :



Mose is counted 7th (Abraham including), as Henoch (Jude 14) 'seventh from Adam' (1 Adam, 2 Seth, 3 Enos, 4 Kenan, 5 Mahalalel, 6 Jared, 7 Henoch), Job *fifth* (without Abraham). He, Job, is therefore but one generation older than Mose. On the ground of this belief on the time of Job, in Syriac Bibles the Book of Job follows immediately after the five books of Moses.

EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

Remarks.

In the last number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, there are several statements and points which call forth a remark.

1. That besides the Literature on the Detroit Gospels mentioned on p. 386, there was no other writing on the subject. In No. 7 of the *Theologisches Literaturblatt* (as early as 14th February), Professor C. R. Gregory gave the whole text of the new paragraph; and in No. 9 of the same journal, Professor J. Kunze published a very clever conjecture, that we must read (τὰ) ἀληθινὰ instead of ἀλλὰ διὰ in the MS.: 'the truth is nigh at hand' instead of 'other dangers.'

2. On p. 406, col. a, the text has got into disorder; the last line but one of the text must come up three lines higher. This might serve as a nice example, how in copying manuscripts of the Bible confusion may have crept into the text. Take a similar example, I hit quite recently. In Wetstein's famous edition of the Greek Testament

(1752), five words have fallen out in Jn 14 f. (καὶ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἔωρακατε αὐτόν), the eye of the compositor falling on the wrong καὶ. The fault seems to have escaped the editor's notice, as it is not corrected at the end of the first or of the second volume. If it had been the case that another edition were derived from Wetstein, probably we would find it there too, just as the misprint ἐτέλεσαν in the edition of Bishop Fell (Oxford, 1675) wandered through 150 years from one edition into another till Basle, 1825 (Ac 13²⁹).

3. But now comes the most startling statement. On p. 424 Professor Sayce mentions Yaûtum, feminine in form, but used in both genders, and 'thus explaining how יהוה, *while continuing feminine in form*, could yet denote a male deity.' I mistrusted my eyes and understanding 'יהוה, feminine in form'! I have read much about יהוה for forty years, but I never remember that any one declared the name to be feminine, nor can I see how this might be. I know that the Septuagint writes ἡ βααλ, but that presupposes the replacing of Baal by *Boshet*, αἰσχύνη, and does not mark a male and female deity; but 'Jahveh' 'continuing feminine in form'! The very first letter of the name, if we accept the etymology of Ex 3, protests against this statement.

As to the rest, the explanation how Yahweh and Elohim stand side by side in Gn 2 is very ingenuous, like Dr. Lindl's explanation of the name Amraphel, and has a parallel in the names του Πησα του Ζοροβαβελ (Lk 3²⁷), if the explanation is true that Zerubbabel *Rhesa*, i.e. Z. the prince, has been made into Zerubbabel (begat) Rhesa (see Plummer, *ad loc.*). Nevertheless, I am not in the least convinced. Please ask Professor Sayce to explain his statement as soon as possible.

EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

P.S.—If I may add a word on my own contribution to the last number, I call attention to the fact that Tertullian, in speaking of Ex 32, names 'tria milia' (*Scorpiace*, 2), but in the best manuscript ten or eleven letters before *tria* are lost; thus he, too, may have had 'viginti tria.' For Nu 25 the latest edition of Tertullian gives 'viginti tria,' but the best manuscript has xxiv.; this being correct.

Did Theology Create Christ?

BY THE REV. JOHN WRIGHT BUCKHAM, D.D., PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY, PACIFIC THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA.

It is a striking and significant fact that the most recent and radical school of New Testament criticism has ceased to recognize that discord and discrepancy among the New Testament writings which not long since were heralded as their chief defect, and has discovered, instead, a harmony even more fatal to the generally accepted view of the Church.

Instead of a Synoptic *versus* a Johannine Christology, a Petrine *versus* a Pauline doctrine, we are pointed to the disconcerting fact that a single suspicious doctrine dominates and harmonizes the entire New Testament literature. It is no less than the speculative doctrine of the divinity of Jesus Christ. The Synoptic Gospels, formerly regarded as artless and innocent narratives, are, we are told, now perceived as wolves in sheep's clothing, theological treatises in the guise of history. A single purpose pervades all—to set forth the human Jesus as the divine Son of God.

The harmony which radical criticism has thus at length discovered in the New Testament, is that which conservative criticism has, from the very first, recognized and built upon. Only, a vast and irreconcilable difference exists between the two as to the cause and explanation of the harmony. The newer radical criticism assumes that it lies in an extraneous, unwarranted doctrinal theory attached to the life and person of the man Jesus as an apologetic. The more conservative criticism, in union with the theology of the Church, holds that this harmony of testimony to the divinity of Christ rises from the irresistible compulsion of His personality, leading the Church from the first, as a unit, to regard Him as divine.

The case of radical criticism would be far stronger were there agreement as to how this doctrine arose and who was responsible for it. Professor Wernle and others are convinced and emphatic in making Paul the inventor of it, and thus the real founder of apostolic and orthodox Christianity. 'The theology of the New Testament is Catholicized Paulinism. Paul is everywhere the starting-point. It is his gospel that now speaks to us out of the words of Jesus and the original

apostles.' The Fourth Gospel is but an echo of the Pauline theology. 'John and Paul are not two theological factors, but one. Were we to accept that St. John formed his conception of Christianity either originally or directly from Jesus' teaching, we should have to refuse St. Paul all originality, for we should leave him scarcely a single independent thought. But it is St. Paul that is original; St. John is not' (*Beginnings of Christianity*, vol. ii. p. 294).

With this judgment of the relation of the author of the Fourth Gospel to Paul, Pfeleiderer (who takes the same general position as Wernle with reference to the apologetic character of the New Testament) is quite out of accord. 'In this ethical mysticism [of the Fourth Gospel] the Pauline opposition of faith and works,' he says, 'is resolved in a higher unity; the Christ mysticism of Paul is reconciled with the practical Christianity of Peter, and an ideal of religion formulated, which allies the mystic union of the individual soul to God and the moral union of man in a brotherhood of love, in a manner scarcely equalled in all religious literature.'¹ In his *Seat of Authority in Religion*, Martineau declared, in comparing Paul and the author of the Fourth Gospel, that 'to carry the same key to both is only to make sure of opening neither.' Thus widely do scholarly judgments vary. Nowhere in literature—it seems to most New Testament readers—is there a more striking illustration of the agreement of two profound, original, constructive minds, of temper and method, than in the consenting Christology of the Pauline and Johannine types. There may be evidences of acquaintanceship; evidence of dependence there is none. Inevitably the question arises: why did these two profoundly reflective minds, neither of them far from the actual historic Jesus, reach virtually the same conclusion as to his divine Sonship, though conceived and expressed so diversely?

Nor is the evidence that this is a free and unintentional harmony, confined to these two writings alone. The Synoptic tradition presents

¹ *Christian Origins*, p. 275.

a germinal Christology moulded by the same independent conviction. The Epistle to the Hebrews discloses a like result—by no means a servile reflexion. The Epistle of Peter concurs. Indeed, the entire apostolic and post-apostolic literature is one symphony of free, harmonious, consenting testimony to this great truth. Strange, if all this is the echo of one man, Paul. Strange, if it is all a delusion, with no warrant in the consciousness of Christ. Stranger still, if the maturing Christian consciousness of twenty centuries, building a Spiritual Kingdom upon the foundations of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone, has mistaken an obscure Jewish prophet—teaching again with clearer insight but with no unique consciousness of relation to the Father, and no sense of a mission beyond his own nation and generation, the familiar truths of righteousness and trust—for the Eternal Son of the Father, the central Revelation of God in

human history. The man Jesus, with His limitations and frailties, we can but recognize as wholly one of ourselves, but the Spirit, the Logos, which dwelt within Him lifting Him into moral perfection and the clear light of undimmed communion with the Father—this is the Eternal Son whom we recognize and worship in Jesus Christ. You say, and well, that this Logos, this Eternal Spirit of goodness, dwells in every human soul. But how obscure, inert, bound and fettered by our evil will and nature! We are but broken lights of that Eternal Logos who shone full-orbed in Jesus Christ.

Inevitably, and rightfully, will the insistence upon the full recognition of the humanity of Jesus appear and reappear in Criticism and in Philosophy. But inevitably also, and victoriously, will there arise anew, just as it first arose in the apostolic age, the consciousness that in the Man of Nazareth, the Eternal Father revealed Himself to humanity through the Eternal Son.

In the Study.

The Country Home.

The Country Home is the title of a new magazine published by Messrs. Archibald Constable & Co. (6d. net).

The Cambridge University Press.

All the books of the Cambridge University Press appeal to the readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. We may therefore record as an item of interest that everything that is published by the Cambridge University Press may now be seen and examined in Edinburgh at 100 Princes Street, the offices of Messrs. Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier.

The Moral Education Congress.

The First International Moral Education Congress will be held in London in September 1908. It opens on the 25th and closes on the 29th. The Prospectus may be obtained from the General Secretary, Mr. Gustav Spiller, 13 Buckingham Street, Strand.

The Book of Ecclesiastes.

Another volume has been published of the 'International Critical Commentary.' It is *The*

Book of Ecclesiastes. The editor is Dr. G. A. Barton, Professor of Biblical Literature and Semitic Languages, in Bryn Mawr College, Pennsylvania. A year or two ago Professor Barton suddenly made a name for himself, and a great name, by his book on *Semitic Origins*. It was that book, no doubt, that suggested his name to the editors of the 'International Critical Commentary.' But since then he has written some very fine Old Testament articles for the forthcoming single-volume *Dictionary of the Bible*.

The Congress of Religions in Oxford.

The Prospectus of Lectures has now been issued. It is magnificent. The Congress at Oxford in 1908 is to be a landmark in the history of Religion. Our readers should write at once for a copy of the Prospectus to Professor Estlin Carpenter, 109 Banbury Road, Oxford, or to Dr. Farnell, 191 Woodstock Road, Oxford.

The Orient in London.

The newspaper has just brought the report of the opening of 'The Orient in London.' Among other attractions, among attractions to other people,

there is a mighty attraction for the student of Religion and Ethics. It is a Hall of Religions. And a Handbook to the Hall of Religions has been prepared under the editorship of the Rev. D. Macfadyen, M.A., the Chairman of Committee.

The Handbook is a valuable contribution to the study of Religion. After the editor's explanation, there is an 'Introduction to Primitive Religion' by Professor A. C. Haddon. Now we know that there is no greater authority on Primitive Religion, in our country at least, than Dr. Haddon. This long article is therefore sufficient of itself to give the Handbook not only present interest but permanent value. Yet that is only one article. The other contributors are the Rev. H. Arnold Cook, M.A., the Rev. W. A. Elliott, of Matabeleland, the Rev. J. G. Hawker (who writes on Indian Religion), the Rev. George Owen (who writes on China), and Professor G. W. Thatcher, M.A., of Mansfield College, Oxford (who writes the article on Muhammadanism).

The immediate aim of 'The Orient in London' is to promote an interest in missions. Missionaries have long felt the need of a training in Comparative Religion. This is the first time that a study of Comparative Religion has been publicly and officially recognized as an important element in the propagation of the gospel.

The Study of Anthropology.

A memorial, signed by many most influential names, is about to be addressed to the Government, praying that an Imperial Bureau of Anthropology may be established in London.

The first paragraph states: 'It has long been felt by anthropologists that the study of anthropology possesses not merely a scientific interest, but has also great practical utility for the nation.' The second paragraph says: 'Several of our distinguished administrators, both in the Colonies and India, have pointed out that most of the mistakes made by officials in dealing with natives are due to the lack of training in the rudiments of ethnology, primitive sociology, and primitive religion. Numerous instances of the troubles arising from this cause can easily be adduced.'

Let us quote the third and the fourth paragraphs

also. This is the third: 'At the time when the "native problem" forms a very important factor in Colonial and Indian administration, we venture to think that the training of young officials is a matter of national importance, and there is evidence that some of our leading administrators are fully alive to its value. Recently, Sir Reginald Wingate addressed a letter to the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge in which he asked whether those Universities were prepared to give instruction in ethnology and primitive religion to probationers for the Sudan Civil Service: the Oxford Anthropological Committee and the Cambridge Board of Anthropological Studies at once replied in the affirmative, and courses of instruction in those subjects have already commenced.'

And this is the fourth paragraph: 'We therefore respectfully submit that the time has arrived when all selected candidates for the Consular, Sudanese, Colonial, and Indian Services should be required to take a course of study in those branches of Ethnology, Sociology, and Religion which have a practical bearing on the races amongst whom their future work will lie.'

The Supreme Virtue.

Something was said 'In the Study' recently about a volume of sermons by the Rev. J. G. K. McClure, D.D., President of McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago. The sermons were preached to the students of different Universities in America, each of them handling some 'supreme thing.' And the title of the volume is *Supreme Things* (Revell). Those who have bought the book since then will not be offended if we return to it this month.

What were the supreme things? The first was the Supreme Revelation—'God so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son.' Not that God loved the world; that was known already, or should have been known. But that God so loved the world that He gave. The next was the Supreme Obligation—'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and soul, and strength, and mind, and thy neighbour as thyself.' Then comes the Supreme Virtue. The supreme virtue is Reverence.

There is not very much about reverence in the

Bible by name, but the thing itself pervades the Bible. How often, for example, does the verb 'to fear' occur in reference to God. Dr. McClure's text is taken from the history of Elijah: 'And it was so, when Elijah heard it that he wrapped his face in his mantle, and went out, and stood in the entering in of the cave' (1 K 19¹⁸). It is a good text. But it is not the only good text in the Bible.

The men who have written most on Reverence and most to the purpose are Cardinal Newman and Professor Momerie. There is a sermon by Newman in the first volume of the *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, of which the text is Ps 2¹¹, 'Serve the Lord with fear, and rejoice with trembling.' There is another in the fifth volume, in which reverence is described as a belief in God's presence, and the unexpected text is Is 33¹⁷, 'Thine eyes shall see the king in his beauty: they shall behold the land that is very far off.' And in the eighth volume there is one on 'Reverence in Worship,' the text 1 S 2¹⁸, 'Samuel ministered before the Lord, being a child, girded with a linen ephod.' The reverence is found in the phrase 'girded with a linen ephod.'

Momerie is a surprise. Did they not say it was want of reverence that made all the mischief with Momerie, that embittered his life and hastened his death? Yet it was Momerie who without a text preached five consecutive sermons on Reverence in the Chapel of the Foundling Hospital, and afterwards published them in a volume on *Church and Creed*, and gave us the best systematic account of reverence in the language.

Phillips Brooks preached on Reverence. In the volume *The Light of the World* his text is 'The Wings of the Seraphim' (Is 6²). In the volume *The Mystery of Iniquity* it is taken from the Apocalypse: 'And the four-and-twenty elders fall down before him that sat on the throne, and worship him that liveth for ever and ever, and cast their crowns before the throne' (Rev 4¹⁰). Dean Vaughan gives us another inevitable text—Ex 3⁵, 'Put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground.' This is in the *Doncaster Sermons*. There is a more original sermon and a more original text for Reverence in the volume *Christ and Human Instincts*. The text is Jn 20²⁸, 'My Lord and my

God,' and the title is 'Christ satisfying the Instinct of Reverence.'

These are not all the sermons on Reverence that are worth looking at, nor are these all the texts. So plentiful are the texts that only in one instance do we find the same text chosen by two preachers. Mr. T. G. Selby, in his *Lesson of a Dilemma*, has a sermon on 'The Call to Reverence' from Ex 3⁵, the text already chosen by Dean Vaughan. But Mr. G. H. Morrison, whose felicity in the choice of a text is one of the secrets of his popularity, chooses Rev 1¹⁷, 'And when I saw him, I fell at his feet as dead.' Mr. A. H. Moncur Sime takes the words 'Fear God' in 1 P 2¹⁷, and Miss Wordsworth, in her ever-fragrant *Thoughts on the Lord's Prayer*, finds the text for a chapter on Reverence in the first petition, 'Hallowed be thy name.'

Now by the time a man has run through all these texts he ought to understand what other men have understood by Reverence, but he will not be superior to a little instruction from the moralists. Sidgwick says briefly that reverence is 'the feeling which accompanies the recognition of superiority or worth in others.' Fowler and Wilson in their *Principles of Morals* distinguish Respect, Admiration, Awe, and Reverence, and on Reverence they say that 'Reverence (of which Veneration is a somewhat feeble synonym) appears to be a combination of love and awe, or, if we resolve Awe into its constituent elements, of love, admiration, and fear.' Professor Mark Baldwin, in his *Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology*, says Reverence is 'disinterested Respect directed towards what is spiritually elevated and ideal,' and then makes this quotation:

Thee I revere for what thou art,
Nor fear for what thou hast,
Still undiscovered by me, in heart
And will. Reveal thy cast
Of soul more fully—still 'tis fast
I feel but reverence.

Thee I revere, unseen the fact
That moves thee for the day—
Unknown the motive to the act
That helps or hurts! But stay,
But go, our friendship by the way—
Still thee I reverence!

Now for Dr. McClure. Dr. McClure gives a

definition, but he does not give it at once. He starts with the question, What is Reverence? but he answers it by saying that it is the mother of all virtues. 'For it is reverence for truth that nourishes honesty, reverence for purity that nourishes chastity, reverence for love that nourishes kindness, and reverence for compassion that nourishes sympathy. To the degree that reverence exists, other virtues exist; to the degree that reverence is absent, other virtues are absent.' Then he uses the effective comparison that as Demosthenes said the most necessary element in oratory is action, action, action; and as Augustine declared that the most necessary grace of heart is humility, humility, humility: so he will affirm that the most necessary feature of character is reverence, reverence, reverence.

His definition is practically that of Sidgwick. When he has given it he passes to the mission of reverence, which he says is fourfold. First, it expresses character; next, it saves from frivolity; then it secures discrimination; lastly, it develops scholarship. Then when he has mentioned the things that stand in the way of reverence in our day (and he seems to think that more things stand in its way in America than elsewhere), he passes to the objects of reverence.

Nature is one. 'The summer after Agassiz's death, his former students at Penikese met again at Penikese and put on the walls this motto from Agassiz's lectures: A laboratory is a sanctuary which nothing profane should enter.' The Bible is another. Humanity is another. God is another. And we ourselves are another object of reverence. 'Oliver Wendell Holmes was past seventy years of age when he wrote a letter from his country home to a friend in town stating that on the preceding Sabbath he had attended the service in the village church, and added as an explanation of such attendance, "There is a little plant called reverence in a corner of my soul's garden which I like to have watered about once a week."' "

The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustration this month has been found by the Rev. George Mackenzie, B.D., Coatbridge, to whom a copy of Chadwick's *Pastoral Teaching of St. Paul* has been sent.

Illustrations for the Great Text for August must be received by the 1st of July. The text is Dt 8².

The Great Text for September is Dt 22⁶—'If a bird's nest chance to be before thee in the way, in any tree or on the ground, with young ones or eggs, and the dam sitting upon the young, or upon the eggs, thou shalt not take the dam with the young.' A copy of Bennett's *Post-Exilic Prophets* or of Astley's *Prehistoric Archaeology and the Old Testament* will be given for the best illustration. Illustrations must be received by the 1st of August.

The Great Text for October is Dt 29²⁹—'The secret things belong unto the Lord our God: but the things that are revealed belong unto us and to our children for ever, that we may do all the words of this law.' A copy of Macgregor's *Jesus Christ the Son of God* or of Burkitt's *Gospel History and its Transmission* will be given for the best illustration. Illustrations must be received by the 1st of September.

The Great Text for November is Dt 30¹⁹—'I call heaven and earth to witness against you this day, that I have set before thee life and death, the blessing and the curse: therefore choose life, that thou mayest live, thou and thy seed.' A copy of any volume of the 'Scholar as Preacher' Series will be given for the best illustration. Illustrations must be received by the 1st of October.

The Great Text for December is Dt 32^{11, 12}—

As an eagle that stirreth up her nest,
That fluttereth over her young,
He spread abroad his wings, he took them,
He bare them on his pinions:
The Lord alone did lead him,
And there was no strange god with him.

A copy of Sarolea's *Newman* and Beveridge's *Makers of the Scottish Church*, or of Adamson's *Lord's Supper*, will be given for the best illustration. Illustrations must be received by the 1st of November.

Those who send illustrations should at the same time name the books they wish sent them if successful.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, St. Cyrus, Montrose, Scotland.